

World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in England in 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 8594. A bill to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 8595. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide that boards for the correction of military or naval records shall take into account evidence relating to the character and conduct of persons subsequent to their discharge from the service in determining whether their records should be corrected; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 8596. A bill to increase the education and training allowances under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. R. 8597. A bill to amend an act of July 3, 1926, relating to the issuance and validity of passports, to change the periods of validity of passports and passport visas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 8598. A bill to amend an act of July 3, 1926, relating to the issuance and validity of passports, to change the periods of validity of passports and passport visas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 8599. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of unsound, unhealthful, diseased, unwholesome or adulterated poultry or poultry products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 477. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. J. Res. 478. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. J. Res. 479. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the national pure food, drug, and cosmetic law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. Res. 377. Resolution directing the United States Tariff Commission to make an investigation to determine whether, as the result of a trade agreement with Japan, fresh or

frozen albacore tuna is being imported in the United States in such increased quantities as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. Res. 378. Resolution directing the United States Tariff Commission to make an investigation to determine whether, as the result of a trade agreement with Japan, fresh or frozen albacore tuna is being imported in the United States in such increased quantities as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Res. 379. Resolution requesting a review of reports on Charleston Harbor, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were represented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing effective aid to labor surplus areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 8600. A bill for the relief of Jana Marie Svidenska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 8601. A bill for the relief of Dr. David Wei Chi Shen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 8602. A bill for the relief of Aneida Alonso Amaral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 8603. A bill for the relief of Robert W. Dewaal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 8604. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shirley Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8605. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Paula Markert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 8606. A bill for the relief of the beneficiaries of William Lee La May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 8607. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to David Peters, or to his heirs or assigns, title to land held by the United States in trust

for him; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 8608. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Di Prima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 8609. A bill for the relief of Shee-go Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 8610. A bill for the relief of Antonio Alejandres-Diaz (also known as Antonio Alejandres-Valencia); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 8611. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sabastiano Poletto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 8612. A bill for the relief of John H. Orth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 8613. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a gold medal of appropriate design to be awarded posthumously by the President to the parents of James Edward Sarra for an act of valor which caused his death; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 8614. A bill for the relief of Maria Knaziewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. Res. 380. A resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 8572, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

440. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of residents of Troy and Bradford County, Pa., favoring the passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

441. By Mr. MUMMA: Petition of Mrs. Mary M. Carnes, and 28 other residents of Duncannon, Pa., and vicinity, urging action on legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

442. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Mrs. Harry Markwart and 35 other citizens of Dallas, Oreg., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Segregation in the Public Schools of Virginia

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1956, Virginians voted overwhelmingly to continue segregation of the races in the public schools of Virginia. The

issue was simple and clear cut. I am proud of the great progress that Virginia has made in building up a great public school system. We have a splendid system but on May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States of America struck our school system a staggering blow which will eventually wreck our schools unless the proper steps are taken to combat the decision. The only hope to save public education in Virginia is the will and the determination of our people to resist tyranny on every occasion and to fight the grasping usurpation of power on the part of those

people in this country who would change the habits, customs, mores and traditions of the people of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The white and Negro races in Virginia each have much to be proud of. We have a fine relationship between the two races. If let alone by outside influence of misguided people we can work out our problems to the mutual satisfaction and advantage of all. I am convinced that if we are to remain strong and aggressive and continue to progress, we must keep intact the integrity and identity of the two races. I believe that



mongrelization of the races will lead to deterioration of the stability of the people of our State and will be ruinous to our advancement as a people. Our people are not going to accept integration of the races in the public schools or the mongrelization of the races. We in Virginia are fighting for a principle that we know to be right and just. We know that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in declaring segregation in the public schools unconstitutional was without authority in law. The Court, against all legal precedent, followed the theory of a foreign-born sociologist who, I am informed, has connections with several groups that have been listed as subversive. This means that we can no longer anticipate what the Court might do or where it might strike next. The Constitution is simply what the nine judges might say it is. They have abrogated unto themselves rights, privileges, and authority that were never given them by the people of this Nation. We of Virginia cannot sit idly by and see the privileges and rights of our people taken from them against their will and in violation of the Constitution by a Court following the theories of a foreign-born sociologist who knows nothing of the ways, habits, customs, traditions, and mores of our people. To stand idle at a time like this would be traitorous to our forefathers as well as to our children and grandchildren. We must not fail by supinely submitting to such desecration. One of the men who has been in the forefront of the fight to continue our way of life in Virginia has been the Honorable W. M. Tuck, Member of the House of Representatives from the Fifth District of Virginia. Representative Tuck is one of the outstanding men of our generation. On every occasion he has been in the forefront fighting to preserve the rights of the people. On January 5, 1956, at Farmville, Va., in my congressional district, Governor Tuck delivered to a large audience an address which in my opinion states the issue clearly and distinctly. Under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith the address of the Honorable W. M. Tuck:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM M. TUCK,  
DEMOCRAT, VIRGINIA, JARMAN HALL, LONG-  
WOOD COLLEGE, FARMVILLE, VA., JANUARY 5,  
1956

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to have this opportunity of appearing before you in support of the proposed constitutional convention in the election to be held on January 9, 1956. I intend to go to the polls early on that date and vote for the convention and to do everything I can appropriately do to insure a large majority at my precinct and in my home county of Halifax.

The issue is a simple one. It concerns itself only with the amendment of section 141 of the Virginia constitution, which at present forbids the appropriation of public money for the support of any school or institution not wholly owned or controlled by the State or some political subdivision thereof. The proposed amendment will authorize the general assembly, if in its discretion it deems wise so to do, to enact a law making it possible for the State and the localities to appropriate public funds or make available grants in aid to individual parents or pupils who wish to attend a pri-

vate nonsectarian school. These grants will apply to both races alike.

We do not vote next Monday on whether we shall have public schools or on any of the many other extraneous matters which have crept into the debate on this subject. The only question at issue next Monday is: Shall there be a constitutional convention to amend section 141 of the Virginia Constitution to authorize the general assembly to enact a law which will permit the State and localities to make funds available to parents who wish to send their sons and daughters to private nonsectarian schools. There is nothing in this proposal to require the general assembly to do anything. It simply expands the constitution to give our representatives more leeway and latitude in dealing with this important and far-reaching subject.

The people of this great Commonwealth understand the problem confronting us. The question is, shall we operate our schools according to the time honored policy of local self-government, or shall we supinely submit to an unwarranted attack upon our rights and liberties and be forced to integrate?

In this matter there is no middle ground. We cannot harmonize, compromise, or temporize. The issue must be met head on. I have said from the very time that this iniquitous decision was rendered, and I shall repeat at every opportunity, that in Virginia we do not intend to send our children to mixed schools.

I have held public office in Virginia for 35 years. There are few others in Virginia now living who have been thus honored and for so long. I shall ever cherish the honors conferred and the trusts imposed, but I would be unfaithful and unworthy if I did not in this tragic hour of our history speak frankly and unequivocally on this subject so close to our hearts and so vital to the welfare and safety of us all. Whether it is popular or unpopular, expedient or inexpedient, polite or impolite, I want it distinctly understood that I am opposed to the mixing and the intermingling of the races in our schools, and I intend to use whatever power and influence I may have to prevent it.

If stating these unequivocal and positive views on this inflammatory subject requires that I be classified as an immoderate or extremist, I will without cringing bear the odium. There is one thing certain: it will never be said of me that I collaborated and that I joined up, directly or indirectly, or in any other way, with our traducers, who would not only expose us to calumny and shame, but who would if they could, encompass the complete destruction of our way of life. We must not let them do it.

This is the issue and I hope and believe that the people of Virginia will be Virginians and vote like Virginians, and will give the proposal an overwhelming endorsement. Although I would warn against overconfidence and taking too much for granted and urge that every possible pro voter to go to the polls next Monday, I predict with complete confidence that the proposed constitutional convention will carry by a substantial majority. Thus, we will have brushed aside with a resounding voice the spurious statements and charges which have been spread to becloud the clear-cut issue.

The constitutional proposal originated with the commission headed by Senator Gray and composed of 32 members of the general assembly from all sections of Virginia and various schools of political thought, who, after giving more than a year's study and consideration to the subject, unanimously recommended it. Governor Stanley approved the proposed constitutional amendment and recommended its adoption. The general assembly at its recent special session approved the amendment by a vote of 131 of its 140 members, with 3 absent. It is

a nonpartisan matter, because all Virginians, irrespective of political party affiliations, are affected and have a deep interest therein. In fact, it comes to us on a nonpartisan basis. The referendum was approved by every Republican in the House of Delegates and by all Democrats except 5, and in the Senate by all Democrats and 2 Republicans with only 1 Republican voting against.

I commend the Governor and the general assembly on the forthright, dignified, and patriotic manner in which they approached the consideration of this problem. In fact, one of the many things for which Virginia is noted and for which she has a just right to be proud is the high caliber of her legislators. Hon. John H. Daniel and Senator James D. Hagood from this legislative and senatorial district are examples of the high qualities of character and leadership which mark the membership of the bodies to which they belong. I am sure that the voters of this district would have no hesitancy in trusting them with matters of public concern and involving the education and training of their children.

I cannot find words sufficient and adequate to commend the people of Prince Edward County for their courage and forthrightness in standing firm against this infamous assault upon our rights. The people of Prince Edward County have enhanced the standing of Virginia and have made pages of history which will ever be cherished by patriots everywhere. Had it not been for your firm and unswerving stand, I fear that we would have already had integration.

I also commend the Defenders of State Sovereignty and Individual Liberties, in which I am proud to hold membership, for its defense of the right of the localities to determine what type of school system they shall operate.

There has been created in Virginia much misunderstanding and unnecessary confusion by the opponents of the referendum. Whether it was intended or not, the facts are, a smokescreen has been set up to hide the real issues and to prevent the matter from being settled upon its merits. When these clouds are dispelled and dissipated and we get down to the plain unvarnished facts and naked truth, there is but one question, and that is whether or not we favor or oppose the mixing of the races in the schools. Those who vote for the amendment will be credited as being opposed to the mixing of the races and those who oppose the convention will be considered as favoring the mixing of the races in the schools. As a matter of fact, many, if not most, of the individuals and organizations who publicly oppose the constitutional change have already declared themselves as favoring the integration of the races, and it is my opinion that if you scratch down deep enough the others who have not so publicly declared themselves are at heart true integrationists.

Now as to whether or not the adoption of this amendment will prove to be against the public interest and so destructive of Virginia's institutions, I would, in addition to our governor and the members of the general assembly list as supporters of this change the names of both of our United States Senators, BYRD and ROBERTSON, two of our former governors, Battle and Darden, the latter of whom is a noted educator and president of our highest seat of learning, the University of Virginia, and now delegate to the United Nations. It has also the support of our State board of education, our superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Dowell J. Howard, as well as all former superintendents including Dr. Harris Hart, and Dr. G. Tyler Miller, now president of Madison College, and Dr. Dabney S. Lancaster, former president of Longwood College at Farmville, at both of which institutions our Virginia teachers are trained. Dr. Lancaster is so firmly convinced of the necessity and soundness of the program that he



has charge of the organizational drive with headquarters in Richmond. He is attempting to see that the people are properly informed as to the facts, and will on January 9 vote for the convention. No persons in Virginia have contributed more to the education and training and culture of the people of Virginia than have these distinguished educators who have devoted a lifetime of service and toil in that field of endeavor. In their endeavors in this direction they are supported by members of school boards, school superintendents, and teachers who have the welfare of Virginia and her people at heart.

The eyes of our Southland and of the Nation are focused upon Virginia and her electorate as never before in recent times. Not in a long time have we had a more challenging situation than that which confronts us. Virginia ranks high in the sisterhood of States, and what we do here may well determine or to a large extent affect the course of other southern States. May the vote on January 9 be a resounding victory for the convention, reflecting the confidence of the people in Virginia leadership, particularly at the educational level, and the course which she is undertaking to establish. May the vote and verdict be such that liberty-loving people everywhere will have a renewed and invigorating faith in the determination of our people to chart their own destiny, free from these evil and extraneous influences from without, which threaten to engulf us and the things which we hold dear.

Unless we choose to resist these outside influences now, the hour may be too late, and we will have accepted without challenge political and judicial doctrines which we hold to be untrue and without foundation.

On December 28, we witnessed in the columns of the newspapers a flagrant and unbridled attempt by outsiders to influence the outcome of next Monday's referendum in favor of integration. It is shocking that this outsider was none other than the United States Department of Justice, and although I have no way of knowing, I have cause to believe that it was the Attorney General of the United States himself. In our daily Virginia newspapers, and in fact all over the Nation, a statement was published as coming from a high Justice Department official in Washington to the effect that such action as we contemplate to set up tuition grants for pupils to attend private schools rather than submit to the unconstitutional act of forced integration of the races would be declared invalid, and that individuals and organizations in Virginia and in the South are being investigated. This self-made and self-appointed law giver and conscriptionist who, for reasons best known to himself, hides behind the cloak of anonymity, would declare the laws of a sovereign State invalid even before they are enacted, and would prevent us in the Commonwealth of Virginia from holding free and untrammelled elections. I demand information as to the authority by which the Justice Department or the Attorney General has set up a secret gestapo to impose upon the people and government of this sovereign Commonwealth a supermonitorship. I dispatched to the Attorney General of the United States a prompt and vigorous protest against this bold and brazen attempt at intimidation and coercion, and I shall continue to make known to those outside meddlers that we do not intend to be bullied by the Attorney General of the United States, the Department of Justice, or others.

In the matter of race relations we have never dealt unkindly with the Negroes. In this regard I can stand upon my record. In 1926 as a young member of the House of Delegates of Virginia I supported the antilynch law enacted at that session recommended by Governor Byrd, the strongest antilynch law on the statute books of any State in the entire Nation. Since that date Virginia has

not suffered a single death by lynching. Among other things, during my own term as governor, I recommended in my very first message to the general assembly an appropriation of \$15,000 for the establishment of a monument to a Virginia Negro, Booker T. Washington. This appropriation was made, and I know of no other State in the Nation, north or south, that has made an appropriation to memorialize a Negro. I entered an executive order setting up a large sum of money for the establishment of a State park for Negroes in Prince Edward County. I entered another order setting aside a day to be known as Joseph Jenkins Roberts Day in honor of a Virginia-born Negro who became the first president of the Republic of Liberia. On another occasion during my term I drove to a small town on the outskirts of Philadelphia to participate in the dedication of a monument to the Negro composer and musician, James A. Bland, who penned that nostalgic song, "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia." That monument, incidentally, was erected by the Lions Clubs of Virginia, and that song was adopted as our official State song by resolution of the General Assembly of Virginia, and there is not a Negro among the membership of either body. I recommended as governor, and the general assembly enacted into law, the largest single general tax increase in the history of the Commonwealth, of which many millions of dollars went for public health and education among both races. I ask where were these lovers of public education then? They were with us until we passed the collection plate and then they vanished and left us to fight the battle alone. My interest and zeal in the education and training of our youth has not diminished since that time. We must make whatever sacrifice in expenditures and effort as may be necessary to ensure the education of our Virginia children, but in separate schools.

After I returned to my home in South Boston, the late Dr. Roper, director of public health, wrote me that during my term, and upon my recommendations, more money had been appropriated for capital outlay in the eradication of tuberculosis in Virginia than had been appropriated through all the combined years that had intervened from the founding of the Virginia Health Department down to that time, and most of this was spent for Negroes, where the disease existed and where the need was greatest. I cite these facts as to my own record for the purpose of demonstrating that I have never exercised authority conferred upon me by the people in a manner unfair or unjust to any minority group, and what is more I never will.

In Virginia our people, I am glad to say, have on the whole kept themselves free from the faithless and perfidious conduct so characteristic of some of our leaders on the national scale who have not hesitated throughout the years to use the Negro as a political pawn.

These modern-day abolitionists and latter-day reconstructionists know nothing about the Negro and his problems and care less. Their principal interest in the Negro is to use him as a vehicle upon which to ride into high public office and to secure their vote in pivotal States to control the election of Governors, Senators, and Presidents. Their actions remind me of Billy Mahone, of Virginia, who was a brave Confederate general under Lee, but who after the war and in the dark days of reconstruction by making wild and chimerical promises succeeded in forming a coalition among the worst elements of both races in our Commonwealth and captured control of the government of Virginia. He himself was elected to a seat in the United States Senate. John Jasper, the celebrated colored preacher of Richmond, had no faith in Billy Mahone and refused to yield to his blandishments. The colored people excel in at least two particulars in that they have superior powers of illustration, and the other

is that they can instantly recognize a gentleman, and vice versa. In order to illustrate his lack of faith in Mahone, the Reverend Jasper told his congregation that he had dreamed of going to heaven and that St. Peter refused him entrance because he was walking. As he dejectedly descended from the pearly heights he met Billy Mahone approaching by foot, his face lighted and filled with hope and ambition. After John had related his difficulties, Mahone replied: "Shucks, John, I can remedy that. Get down on your all fours and I will get on your back and ride you right through the pearly gates and then we will both be in heaven." John succumbed to his plea, particularly since Mahone weighed less than 100 pounds. After again wending his weary way to the celestial portals with Mahone on his back, the latter knocked, and St. Peter said: "Who comes there?" Mahone replied: "This is United States Senator Billy Mahone, of the Commonwealth of Virginia, late a major general in the Confederate States Army of America." "Are you riding, or are you walking," said the keeper of the gates. "I am riding, sir," replied Mahone. Then the heavenly gates opened and Mahone tied his faithful "horse," John Jasper, on the outside, deserting the vehicle upon which he had gone to glory, and went in to enjoy the pleasures of heaven.

I am proud of the fact, as all patriotic Virginians should be, that the white and colored people have lived here in our Commonwealth in peace and harmony for more than 300 years—longer than any other place in the Western Hemisphere. We understand each other's problems and we have been able to maintain mutual respect. I confidently predict that we will continue to coexist on the same sort of basis despite the handicaps imposed upon us by the decision of the United States Supreme Court, which has inflamed bitterness and anger where it previously existed and has spread it into areas where it did not heretofore exist. It has fostered and provoked anger, discord, and distrust. As harsh as it may seem, I am constrained to say that any Christian gentleman would be ashamed of being the author of such a situation. The dangers and implications of the Supreme Court decision transcend the race question because it threatens to destroy the basic political philosophy upon which our Nation was founded. The Court has undertaken to override the constitutional division of powers by judicial fiat, without respect to its own previous decisions, and in contravention of the same, and in violation likewise of the powers of the legislative branch of the National Government, as well as the constitutional powers of the respective States.

The authority cited for this monstrosity was the maudlin views of at least one sociologist of questionable repute and loyalty, whose name blackens the pages of the reports of the Un-American Activities Committee of the United States House of Representatives. On such authority the Court has attempted to reverse the exact intention of the framers of the Constitution, not by the due processes of constitutional amendment, but by arbitrary decision unrelated to the law precedent or the facts. Because the Supreme Court has strayed so far beyond the constitutional framework, it behooves the people to adopt such measures as may be necessary to restore the traditional balances of power which have raised this Nation to a position of greatness.

For more than 50 years, the Supreme Court of the United States had stood by the principle of separate but equal school facilities for the races. At least five previous decisions of the United States Supreme Court of this period have upheld the constitutional rights of the separate States to control their own schools. It is strange that this long chain of opinions and the constitutions of many



States, including our own, should be upset, reversed, nullified and scrapped, jeopardizing the public schools of a large segment of the country, as well as the wishes, traditions and the rights of millions of our citizens.

This is one sample of what can happen when we deviate from government based on the Constitution. Under the cloak of judicial robes a "super legislature" has arisen with a veto power over the rights of the States and the people. It is time that we, through our State governments, reasserted the powers that were reserved to us under the Constitution. On the basis of Constitutional considerations, as well as common sense, the States have every right to operate their public schools as they see fit. We here in Virginia have not become so destitute of mind and character, as well as of ability to govern ourselves, that we are ready to ask anyone to cross over the Potomac and indoctrinate us with false and spurious doctrines that are alien to our American way of life.

If we are to maintain our liberties and freedom as well as our State functions, we have a long, hard fight and rocky road ahead. It will require sacrifice, endurance and patience. If we are to succeed we must unite and stand together. With the weight of the long line of judicial and historical precedents to support us, and with right on our side, and determination in our hearts, how can we fail in the venture to protect our children and children's children.

What can or shall we do in this momentous hour? There are 2 things we can do, yea, 3 and more. First, we can go out early next Monday morning and vote for the constitutional convention. Secondly, we can join the Defenders of State Sovereignty and Individual Liberties and ally ourselves with that patriotic organization which was conceived in love not hate. Thirdly, we can stand upon the ramparts of liberty unruffled, unashamed and unafraid, and let these impertinent meddlers know that we are determined never to surrender our freedom. We will also let them know that we will not forsake our children and grandchildren who in their innocence and helplessness are now playing around the family fireside and hearthstones and have none but us to whom they can look for deliverance from these flagitious forces who would not only mongrelize them and destroy the identity of both races, but also deprive and deny them and all others the constitutional guarantees for which our forefathers struggled so hard and which we have enjoyed for so long. In such a crises with so much at stake we shall not flag or fail, we will resist to the end. Our children will rise up to love, to praise, and to bless us. They will never, no never, have cause to look upon our faces or reflect upon our memories in dishonor, disdain and scorn. Hence, we will go forth inspired by an infallible and unflinching courage so well exemplified by Napoleon's 14 year old drummer boy on the battle fields of Austerlitz 150 year's ago, to be exact the 5th day of December, 1805, and we will never beat a retreat. In that battle Napoleon's trained soldiers and seasoned troops were retiring from the field in disorder. This brilliant but heartless general and dictator was faced with what he thought was certain defeat and in an effort to restore some semblance of order among his troops, he galloped up on his steed to the 14 year old drummer boy and commanded him to beat a retreat. The young man looked up into the face of his mighty and gallant commander and replied, "Sir, in the Army of Napoleon I have never been taught to beat a retreat, but I can beat a battle charge that will wake the dead upon this field." Napoleon then commanded him to do so. The men of that army were so stirred by the musical notes emanating from the drum, as well as the courage of that boy, that they reformed the battle lines and won

the battle of Austerlitz, thus bringing to the Emperor Napoleon and to France one of the most glorious victories ever established on any field of battle in the annals of military history. Sustained by such unflinching determination and imbued with quality of character which constitutes manhood and which enables us to meet danger with a firmness of spirit that knows no fear, victory on Monday will surely be ours to claim.

In the dark days of World War II when England was being bombarded by day and night and an invasion of the channel and the fall of that country was imminent, the late King George in one of his speeches used this quotation, "I asked the man who stood at the gate of the year to give me a light that I may tread safely into the unknown," and he replied, "Go out into the darkness, put your hand into the hand of God, that shall be to you better than a light and safer than a known way."

"God of our fathers, known of old,  
Lord of our far-flung battleline,  
Beneath whose awful hand we hold  
Dominion over palm and pine,  
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,  
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

**Address by Congressman Benjamin F. James, of Pennsylvania, at Commemorative Exercises Marking the 250th Anniversary of the Birth of Benjamin Franklin, at the Government Printing Office, January 17, 1956**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 18, 1956*

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by our distinguished colleague, Representative BENJAMIN F. JAMES, at the commemorative exercises marking the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, at the Government Printing Office, January 17, 1956.

We all know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a valuable and able Member of the House and an impressive speaker. I have particular knowledge of and admiration for his ability, because we work together on the Committee on Appropriations. His selection, however, as the principal speaker for this commemorative occasion was peculiarly appropriate. He is not only the namesake of the great American patriot, but also now owns and operates the printing business which Benjamin Franklin established and operated. I know that his remarks at the ceremony will be of unusual interest to this House:

Let me say at once I feel highly honored with the privilege of having a part in this fine program commemorating the 250th anniversary of the birth of the amazing Benjamin Franklin—the first civilized American and the patron saint of printers.

From the earliest time that Benjamin Franklin became a popular subject for authors, biographers, and orators, until the present—250 years after his birth—something over 1,000 separate works about him

(some of them very extensive indeed) have been compiled and published.

There has been a tendency in Franklin scholarship that has emphasized the philosopher, the scientist, inventor, diplomat, the man of broad international culture, the patriot, and the author, and even the lover, all at far greater extent than Franklin the printer.

This despite the fact that Franklin's phenomenal success as a printer and a publisher was the springboard—economically and politically—for his advancement in the many and varied fields of endeavor that claimed his interest.

Eulogies in vast numbers have been pronounced on many occasions.

The shortest and pithiest of these was by Whitelaw Reid, himself a distinguished journalist, who once said, rather incidentally in a speech about something else:

"I honor the memory of Benjamin Franklin because he was a philosopher who wrote commonsense, an officeholder who did not steal, and a journeyman printer who did not drink."

Then there is the little story of a young scholar whose class was given the assignment of writing a brief composition about Benjamin Franklin. This lad turned in the following:

"Benjamin Franklin was born at a very early age in Boston, on a street called Milk. He went to school for 2 years and then went into the printing business with his brother. He didn't like his brother so he took a boat and went to Philadelphia. He was very hungry when he got off the boat so he bought two loaves of bread and carried one of them under his arm while eating the other. This made a young lady smile at him, so he married her and discovered electricity."

That is brevity in rare form, but it does make the point that in the public mind two things about Franklin are preeminent—his association with the printing business, which was real, and the completely false notion that he discovered electricity.

This evening I should like to speak particularly about Benjamin Franklin, the printer. It seems most appropriate that I should do so here in this, the greatest of all printshops in our day.

It will not be my purpose, however, to trace an orderly account of his career in printing, of his experiences as an apprentice with his brother, James, or with his partners in Philadelphia and also in five of the colonies, in Jamaica and in Antigua.

However, some discussion of the social and economic climate in which Franklin learned his trade and then followed it as the leading master printer of his time will be helpful to an understanding of the role of a printer in colonial America.

The printer then was a jack of many skills and trades, which in these times of specialization and modern equipment are all separate and distinct callings.

Were we able to compress into one person a typographer, pressman, advertising man, author, magazine and newspaper publisher, reporter and editor, stationer and bookseller we would have an amalgam somewhat resembling the early American master printer.

At the time that Franklin became an apprentice in his brother's shop in Boston the printer had not yet achieved an honorable and influential status in the American Colonies except possibly in the city of Philadelphia and doubtless that exception was owing to the broad, tolerant policy of William Penn.

As late as 1733 the Governor of New York felt obliged, for some offense, real or imagined, to stop the press then running in that city.

In 1718 the Governor of Virginia, when advertising a reward for the capture of pirates, was compelled to send to Philadelphia to have the handbills struck off. On



another occasion that same Governor thanked God they had no press in Virginia.

Earlier—in 1686, Governor Bradford of Massachusetts had forbidden anyone to print without his consent.

Four years before that, the General Court of Massachusetts had decreed that there should be no printing press used except one at Cambridge, and that one only under the supervision of two licensees.

These restrictions were apparently deemed necessary to prevent editorial and printed abuse of the constituted and privileged authorities.

Even in Philadelphia in those days printing was not regarded as a preferred occupation, but the road to better conditions in that city in the printing trade was yet to be plotted by Benjamin Franklin.

Although printing dealt with making books, of which the youthful Benjamin was so much enamored almost from babyhood, he was not inclined to look with favor upon learning the printer's trade. However, the decision was his father's and he was apprenticed, or bound, to his brother James, a master printer in Boston, for a term of 9 years.

His father's first choice for the boy's future had been the trade of the cutler, but the terms demanded by the master cutler required that he be paid a sum equal to about \$100, whereas the price named by James Franklin for his brother's instruction in the printer's art was equal to about \$50.

It might be said, the want of \$50 made Benjamin Franklin a printer instead of a cutler.

In addition to the payment of a lump sum for instruction, his brother would, of course, have his free services during the term of the apprenticeship.

A rather elaborate contract had to be drawn between Franklin's father and his brother James, in which Benjamin was bound to a number of obligations such as keeping his master's secrets, gladly performing his lawful commands, he must not frequent taverns, inns, or alehouses—play at cards, dice tables or other unlawful games—he might not contract matrimony nor absent himself from his master day or night—but, above all, demean and behave himself toward his master during all the said term.

In consideration of all this, the master also assumed a few obligations. The following is from the document given by James Franklin to the father of Benjamin Franklin:

"The said James Franklin, master printer, for and in consideration of the sum of ten pounds of lawful British money, to him in hand paid by the said Josiah Franklin, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, the said apprentice in the art of a printer which he now useth he shall teach and instruct, or cause to be taught and instructed, the best way and manner that he can, finding and allowing unto the said apprentice meat, drink, washing, lodging and all other necessities during the said term."

Further terms of the contract are quaint and somewhat amusing. The master was obliged to provide apparel for the apprentice, described thus:

"A pair of deerskin breeches coming hardly down to his knees, which, before they could be allowed to come into the presence of ladies, at meeting, on the Sabbath, were regularly to be blacked upon the preceding night, in order to give them a clean and fresh appearance for the Sunday; a pair of woolen yarn stockings, a thick and substantial pair of shoes, well greased and ornamented with a pair of small, brass buckles (the latter however to be a present for his good behavior)—a speckled shirt for all the week—and a white one for Sunday—which was always carefully to be taken off as soon

as he returned from meeting, folded up and laid by for the next Sabbath."

Franklin once commented that the leather breeches, after several years of wear, became greasy as they grew old and could only be kept flexible when worn, by the superflux of youthful heat.

Thus was Benjamin Franklin, a lad of but 12 years, launched upon a career destined to land him, when only 42 years of age, at the port of wealth and influence, and bring him, in his riper years, greater and greater distinction—not only in his beloved land, but throughout the civilized world.

James Franklin proved to be a mean taskmaster and occasion presenting itself, Benjamin broke the indentures that bound him and though but a lad of 16 years, fearlessly started out to make his way elsewhere.

He arrived in Philadelphia on a Sunday morning in October, in the year 1723, and though his apprenticeship in point of time had been but half completed, he was even then a competent journeyman printer, as well as something of a writer. He found ready employment in the shop of Samuel Keimer, one of the two printers then established in that city. Keimer was slovenly in person and in business, according to Franklin—suspicious and something of a knave withal. This employment was not happy nor did it last long.

The following year a trip was made to Boston at the suggestion of Governor Keith of Pennsylvania, who had become attracted to young Franklin, but who proved to be a very unreliable patron. At Keith's suggestion Franklin sought assistance from his father, Josiah, to the purpose of starting a printing business of his own in Philadelphia.

His father, however, took a dim view of the lad's plans, saying that "Keith must be of small discretion to think of setting up a boy in business who still wanted 3 years of being of man's estate."

Though help was refused by the elder Franklin, advice was generously given, "telling me," as Franklin says, "that by steady industry and prudent parsimony, I might save enough by the time I was 1 and 20 to set me up; that if I came near to the matter he would help me out with the rest."

In December 1724, Franklin sailed for England, again following irresponsible advice and promises by Governor Keith, which were never kept.

The journey was not without profit, however, for he spent nearly 2 years there working for two of London's foremost printers; much improving his knowledge of the business and his skill as a craftsman.

In 1726 he returned to Philadelphia, again went to work for Keimer, for—though still determined to go into business on his own, earnings were needed in the meantime.

An incident occurred at about this time of lasting interest, for he fell ill of the pleurisy and in the certainty that he was about to die, he wrote the famous epitaph, which to this day remains one of the most remarkable and widely known writings of its kind. In it he proudly identified himself for posterity with his craft, just as he did later, in his last will—as Benjamin Franklin, Printer.

In the spring of 1728 there was a day to mark the beginning of a new era in the history of printing in America.

The types and press ordered earlier from a London firm by Benjamin Franklin arrived in Philadelphia and were being installed at No. 51 High Street, and the firm name, Franklin and Meredith was hung above the door.

Meredith was a printer in Keimer's shop and a friend of Franklin's. He had been given to overindulgence in drink and Franklin, by advice and example, had redeemed him to a very creditable degree. In gratitude Meredith's father furnished a sum of

money, though not wholly adequate, for the purchase of equipment, in return for a partnership—and probably further moral support—for his son. This partnership, however, was dissolved, in 1730, and Franklin became sole owner of the business.

In his autobiography Franklin says that at the time of the beginning of this new firm it was freely predicted that Franklin and Meredith must fail as there were already too many printers in the city. Yet there were only two, one of them Andrew Bradford, the other Samuel Keimer, and neither had the grasp and knowledge of his business possessed by the youthful Franklin.

Franklin did not just hang out his sign, announce that he was in business and wait for customers.

When he and Meredith opened for business, the public printer of Pennsylvania was Andrew Bradford, a dilatory man whose competition had been negligible and only from the highly incompetent Samuel Keimer.

Evidently, the bounty of the public purse was just as alluring in Franklin's day as in our times and political security was then, as now, a dangerous illusion.

Franklin therefore aimed his first competition at Bradford's most lucrative plum, the public printing of the Assembly of Pennsylvania which promptly fell right into his lap.

To use his own words "Bradford had printed an address of the House by the Governor, in a coarse, blundering manner." We reprinted it elegantly and correctly and sent one to every Member. They were sensible of the difference; it strengthened the hands of our friends in the House, and they voted us their printers for the year ensuing.

This, I venture to say, was the beginning of modern lobbying technique in America.

From that year, 1730, until his retirement, Franklin remained the official public printer of Pennsylvania.

In 1736 he clinched the contract by getting himself appointed clerk to the assembly, thus insuring, without interference, the direct transmission of printing orders from the assembly directly to the printer.

This clerkship was Franklin's first political post and his first step in a long career in public service.

Undoubtedly the public printing business was the foundation and side walls of Franklin's Way to Wealth.

At about the same time that he took the job of clerk to the assembly he also broke Bradford's monopoly in the newspaper field.

Keimer, in competition with Bradford's paper, the American Weekly Mercury, had issued on December 24, 1728, his first edition of a weekly called by the impressive title, "The Universal Instructor in All Arts and Sciences and Pennsylvania Gazette."

Within 6 months Keimer was through. He never had over 100 subscribers so he offered the paper to Franklin for what Franklin called a "trifle."

On October 2, 1729, Franklin began publishing the paper with a more reasonable title "The Pennsylvania Gazette." That paper was published regularly until 1815, 25 years after his death.

Franklin was a keen newspaperman. He knew that controversial issues created reader interest, and he has told of controversies he published which, as he says, "Got the publisher and editor talked about by the principal people involved and in a few weeks brought them all in as subscribers."

There is no complete list of books that Franklin and his various partners published from 1728 until 1766, when he sold his interest in the firm to David Hall whom he had taken into a partnership 18 years earlier.

The most reliable count of Franklin's imprints, made about half a century ago, recorded at that time 759 titles.



Next in importance to the public printing were religious works and sermons and books on theology, as a group.

He was not a sectarian publisher and the religious works he wrote, or edited, and published amply covered the field of all sects sheltered under William Penn's "freedom to worship" policy.

Next to religious works and very important profitwise were his almanacs. Of the 759 known items Franklin published, religious titles accounted for 148 and almanacs for 119 items. Very likely even more have now been accounted for.

One item—Poor Richard's Almanack, regularly published for 26 years, far outsold all of its competitors, but he did not carry all of his almanac eggs in one basket. In one year, 1751, he issued six different almanacs, one in the German language and one in the export field called The Barbados Almanac.

I have mentioned briefly some of the important items printed and published by Franklin but there were other and very profitable items such as forms, letterheads, announcements, and such materials as the job printer and stationer supplies.

In those days it was the custom to print certain business forms, such as bills of lading starting with the words "By the grace of God." Franklin felt that some users of these forms might prefer to have those words omitted so he advertised that he would supply bills of lading with or without the grace of God.

Nor have I accounted for the great numbers of pamphlets which he wrote and printed on the philosophical society, the university, and the library company—all of which he helped to found: on his stove, on electricity, medicine, and on politics.

At 42 years of age Franklin had made amply secure his future, financially, and then retired from active participation in the business so that he might have more time for the increasing burdens of public service and his many other interests.

It may be fairly said that Poor Richard's words of worldly wisdom, his pamphlets, his pen, and printing press did more to mould the new American character than any other influence in his time.

A delegate to the First Congress assembled in America at Albany, N. Y., in 1754, he presented his plan for the union of the colonies, which unquestionably awakened in the minds of the colonists a new national consciousness. Many regard this as Franklin's most significant contribution in behalf of the independence of our country.

George Washington, to whom we refer affectionately as the Father of Our Country, was in that same year, 1754, a lad of about 20 years, mainly occupied with the task of surveying his family's estates in Virginia.

Franklin died at the age of 84 years and 3 months, soon after Washington, at the age of 57, was inaugurated first President of the United States.

I would like to now conclude this discussion of Benjamin Franklin, printer, by recalling, what we must believe he valued among the finest rewards of a life of devoted service to his country and to mankind.

It was a letter that he received on his deathbed, but while he was still in possession of his faculties and ability to clearly comprehend, which I now read:

"If to be venerated for benevolence—if to be admired for talent—if to be beloved for philanthropies—can gratify the human mind, you must have the present consolation to know that you have not lived in vain; and I flatter myself that it will not be ranked among the least grateful occurrences of your life to be assured that, so long as I retain my memory, you will be recollected with respect, veneration, and affection by your sincere friend, George Washington."

## Albert Gallatin, a Great Swiss-American Patriot

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching January 29, the birth date of Albert Gallatin.

From the very inception of the democratic way of life on our shores there have come from across the seas men and women whose contribution it was to help build America into a nation that is today the freest, richest, and most powerful on earth.

Some came in time of war and others came in time of peace. The illustrious names of Lafayette, Kosciuszko, Von Steuben, Rochambeau are known to all of us as the heroes whose assistance on the fields of battle or on the high seas helped the colonials throw off the yoke of the foreign oppressor. Their military feats are forever enshrined in the memories of our people.

But after the birth of the Nation came the growth of the Nation. It was then the young Republic turned to heroes of another sort, men whose job it was to fill out the democratic framework which had been erected at such cost.

Such a man was the young Swiss-born Albert Gallatin, a youth of 13 in Geneva when our great Revolutionary War began. Born on January 29, 1761, and an immigrant at 19, Gallatin, as Senator, Congressman, and Secretary of the Treasury, was destined to fulfill himself nobly as an American and to earn for himself, in the company of such giants as Washington, Jefferson, Madison, John Adams, the title of Founding Fathers.

His history as an American began in 1780 when he landed in Boston, fired with the concept of democracy he was never to forget, even in the most provoking circumstances.

For Gallatin, whom Jefferson called a man "of a pure integrity, and as zealously devoted to the liberties and interests of our country as its most affectionate native citizen," was, during his early political career, to be submitted to the most outrageous attacks because of his foreign birth.

When Gallatin entered Congress in 1795 and had the temerity to challenge the fiscal operations of the United States under the Federalists, Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton was in power. And, smarting under the demand that the Treasury must account to the people for its expenditures, Hamilton and his associates unleashed their attack on Gallatin who, nonetheless, achieved his purpose by keeping a cool head on his shoulders and fighting with the immense financial learning he commanded.

In 1801, when the Federalists were defeated by Jefferson and Gallatin was named Secretary of the Treasury, the

Federalist attack on Gallatin was renewed; but he was to weather it, and, in the course of his tenure, substantially reduce the national debt, lower taxes, and develop and extend the credit and commercial relations of his adopted land in the markets of Europe.

Idealism, tempered by a respect for thrift and work, made Gallatin an ideal addition to the party of Jefferson and Madison. His early and exacting training in Switzerland, plus a natural aptitude for finance, were the very leaven his party needed to achieve the prosperity which, along with its democratic ideas, won and kept the support of the people.

Sound commercial relations—not war—offered the key to prosperity in Gallatin's thinking; and his policies were to bring the young Republic enormous dividends, and even the friendship of England with which he negotiated a commercial treaty following the War of 1812 which abolished all discriminatory duties.

In this light, it might be well to re-evaluate some of our Government's recent decisions to place pitfalls in the way of commercial harmony. I refer especially to the increase in the watch tariff last year which affects the country of Gallatin's birth and our own country as well.

A successful working through of this tariff problem, in the light of Gallatin's precepts, is one way America can now profit from the exemplary life of this devoted adopted son.

## Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, at Marshall College

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday it was my pleasure to address a forum at Marshall College in Huntington, W. Va., on the subject of the administration's foreign policy in the European area.

I was pleased to share the platform with my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who discussed the problems of our relations with Asian lands.

I send to the desk the text of my own address, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY COMMENDS EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION FOREIGN POLICY; SAYS NON-PARTISAN UNITY MORE ESSENTIAL THAN EVER BEFORE; URGES DEMOCRATS MAKE THEIR CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISMS, IF ANY, "MORE SPECIFIC"

It is a pleasure for me to address this fine assembly, and to share the platform with my



colleague from my neighbor State of Minnesota.

One of his many important services these days is his chairmanship of an exceedingly important subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, devoted to the vital problem of disarmament proposals.

#### SENATOR HUMPHREY'S POSITION AND MINE

My colleague has become somewhat of a specialist in disarmament. But I trust that when he gets around to any references to the Democratic Party, that his remarks tonight will not prove too "disarming."

Seriously, I know that you will enjoy his remarks, because Senator HUMPHREY has shown great interest in the problems of Asia and real understanding, just as he has been very alert to our problems in Europe as well.

Before I proceed further, may I say that, although my good friend from Minnesota and I have frankly disagreed at times on some domestic issues, we have voted side by side and fought, shoulder to shoulder, on some of the key international questions of our time.

We have both been supporters of the basic policies aimed at constructive American leadership in the contracted world of the air atomic age.

We have both fought against those narrow, backward-looking forces which, ostrich-like, would try to "bury America's head in the sand."

We have both fought for a strong technical aid program to uplift the standards of living in the under-developed areas of the world. And I could cite other instances of our unity as well.

Later on, I shall refer to the points on which we differ somewhat—points which will become apparent to you, as we both proceed to the substances of our remarks.

#### EUROPE—A KEY TO THE WORLD BALANCE

But first, let us turn to the European area, as such—Europe, the industrial, political, and cultural cradle of our own Western civilization, Europe—the area of our principal ancestry, Europe—the principal arena of the forces that have molded the 20th century.

It is in Europe that communism first established its beachhead. It is in Europe that it gained its home base for aggression. It is in Europe that it made its first spectacular advances. It is in Europe that it posed its most serious threat after World War II. And it is in Europe, where, thanks to the Marshall plan, NATO, and now the Western European Union, that a rough equilibrium has been achieved, stopping communism, at least temporarily, in its tracks.

Most observers, I think, would agree that our most impressive successes in postwar foreign policy have tended to be in the European area, whereas our most significant and ominous problems tend to be in the Asian area, to which Senator HUMPHREY will refer.

#### EUROPE, ASIA INTERRELATED

Europe and Asia are hardly disconnected, however. They can hardly be spoken of, as if they were separate problems.

Although I shall confine my own remarks principally to the European area, as requested, it is almost inevitable that some of my comments will lap over into the Middle East, Africa, Asia, and, indeed, South American areas as well, just as will Senator HUMPHREY's comments overlap somewhat.

One cannot talk, for example, about continued prosperity of Great Britain without referring to her considerable dependence upon pound sterling earnings in the troubled Middle East and southeast Asia.

One cannot talk about France, without immediately bringing up the sore problem of self-deterioration in North Africa.

One cannot speak in terms of our NATO relations, without almost automatically

bringing up problems of our relations with the colonial and former colonial areas which belong now or used to belong to some of the NATO powers.

Obviously, the world today is an interrelated unit—economically, politically, militarily, socially. Of course, this world is divided by the still formidable Iron Curtain. Nevertheless, a solution to our problems in Europe is crucially dependent upon success of our decisions in other areas, and vice versa.

Thus, when you think about our relations with our friends in, say, Portugal, it is more than a European problem. You must also bear in mind the problems of our relations with our friends in India and the specific, difficult problem of Goa.

You must think, however, as well, of those crucial Azores bases—belonging to Portugal—which are an indispensable link in our own Atlantic chain of defense.

#### KEEP BROAD PERSPECTIVE

We need, therefore, to keep an overall and broad perspective.

A segmented view of the world—a view of merely Asia's or Europe's problems—all by themselves—may tend to be narrow and distorted.

Our problems are complex and interwoven. We dare not ignore dangerous side-effects and after-effects of our European actions in Asia, nor of our Asian actions in Europe.

#### A BALANCE SHEET OF EUROPEAN POLICIES

Now, let us draw up a balance-sheet in Europe.

What does it show? How successful have our policies been there?

I believe—very successful indeed, although obviously far from perfect.

On the "plus" side of the ledger, our achievements in Europe have been:

1. The coming into being of the Western European Union, as a substitute for the European Defense Community.

WEU is not a perfect substitute, but it is an effective working alternative for achieving greater unity, principally between those two traditional enemies—France and Germany.

2. A second success is the reentry by the people of Germany into the family of sovereign nations.

Unhappily, it is only the people of the Federal Republic of Germany, that is, West Germany. But we are continuing our efforts looking toward the earliest possible unification of both zones, along free and democratic lines.

3. The regaining by the people of Austria of their long-sought independence.

4. The settlement of the bitter Italian-Yugoslav dispute over Trieste.

5. Progress under the High Coal and Steel Authority, and steps toward other economic integration.

6. The taking of the necessary steps to bring into being the United Nations Atomic Agency. These steps have been spearheaded by the Atlantic powers which have made the most progress in peaceful application of atomic energy. But non-European powers are of course also included.

7. The continued strengthening of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, including efforts, most recently, designed to lead toward a NATO radar system.

8. The entry of additional free European powers into the United Nations, including countries such as Ireland, Italy, and Spain, which had heretofore been arbitrarily excluded by Soviet veto.

9. The continued booming prosperity of Western Europe which, while it is occasionally marred here or there, has been surpassing almost all prewar records in production and consumption.

These are a few elements of the positive side of the ledger. These are the assets, the gains, the pluses.

#### THE PROBLEM SIDE OF THE LEDGER

No one should, however, ignore the continuing difficulties.

1. Foremost among those difficulties is, of course, that faced by our friends in the uneasy Republic of France.

You are all familiar with the serious parliamentary deadlock between the forces of the right center and the left center, led respectively by former Prime Minister Faure and former Prime Minister Mendes-France.

You recognize how the diabolic Communists will continue to attempt to throw the monkey wrench into France's parliamentary system, by virtue of the fact that they now command 145 seats in the French Assembly out of 594. You recognize too, the unsettling effect of the 52 Assembly votes on the extreme right.

2. Secondly, you are familiar with the disarrangement of the Saar agreement by the recent pro-German votes.

The Western European Union is, of course, hinged on French-German agreement on the Saar.

So, a great deal more must still be done to patch up the obvious differences which have occurred in that iron- and steel-rich area.

#### THREE DANGERS IN NORTH AFRICA

3. Thirdly, everyone is all too aware these days of the threat posed to the Atlantic powers by the continued serious disturbances in North Africa, particularly in Morocco and Algeria.

The riots and fighting there are not only of grave concern to our French friends, but are of particular concern to ourselves in view of three facts:

(a) The strategic stake which we have in the areas because of the presence of our Strategic Air Command bases. (These bases, I need not remind you, are a crucial part of America's principal deterrent against world war III.)

(b) The dangerous effect of the disturbances on the whole Moslem world—stretching from North Africa through the explosive Middle East—through Pakistan and all the way to Islamic Indonesia.

(c) The fact that France has drained off 300,000 troops for North African duty, and thus has seriously depleted NATO strength in Europe.

#### DEPRESSED AREAS IN ITALY

4. Another of the continuing problems is the fact that in some areas in Europe, there are still considerably depressed segments of national economies.

The principal example is, of course, in our good ally, Italy. There, in spite of an enormous financial commitment by the United States, and in spite of strenuous efforts by the Government, a vast unemployment problem continues to exist. Meanwhile, land redistribution in Italy has not achieved anywhere near its fullest goals, and there is considerable want and privation among many of the Italian people, especially in the south.

#### HOW LARGE SHOULD NATO'S GROUND FORCES BE?

5. Another key question relates to NATO's adequacy in the light of changing facts of the air-atomic age.

We must remember that the ground area of Western Europe is actually comparatively small.

That means that supersonic jet planes—fighters and bombers—could streak from Soviet bases across the entire NATO area in a matter of minutes and hours.

Moreover, the Soviets are constantly modernizing their armed forces. And so, we have an enormous problem in terms of modernizing NATO forces, as well.

NATO weapons are quickly becoming obsolete. The question is: Who is to foot the new bill? How much can Uncle Sam afford to provide?

A related question is: How large should NATO's ground forces be, considering the



fact that the principal threat to NATO may come from air-atomic weapons, rather than from the traditional-type infantry—ground assault?

Inevitably, the Western European countries find themselves pinched in their military budgets. Inevitably, there is pressure to reduce the size of their ground forces. (This is so, particularly, in view of occasional Soviet smiles and sweet talk.) One can see the impact in virtually every one of the NATO powers. Thus, in some of these powers, there is a tendency drastically to shorten the period of military enlistment, indeed, to make it so short that the men may not have sufficient specialized training at all.

#### PARLIAMENTARY PROBLEMS IN THE WEST

6. We turn to a sixth problem, relating to recurrent parliamentary crises. Even so relatively stable a country as Britain—which has had only 3 changes in the postwar era, in comparison to France's 22 governments since 1945—even Britain has had her parliamentary conflicts.

Prime Minister Eden, for example, has found himself in difficulty because of a combination of crises in the Middle East—where Britain has traditionally exerted a paramount influence—and because of the United Kingdom's serious economic problems as well.

#### OUR REVIEW OF THESE PROBLEMS

These, then, are but a few of the problems which exist.

No one should underestimate these problems. Senator HUMPHREY and I, as well as our colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees, "wrestle" virtually every week with these problems.

Very shortly we will be making an intensive review of the administration's mutual-security requests for the coming fiscal year; and, no doubt, many of these specific problems will be coming up.

#### THE CONTINUING CRISIS IN MIDDLE EAST

Also looming large will be the continuing crisis in the Middle East.

I need not tell you that a match which might be lit near that powder keg could explode in a manner which might quickly engulf not only Europe, but Asia and the Western Hemisphere as well.

Secretary Dulles has, of course, been making an intensive effort to compose the bitter Arab-Israeli dispute. Progress has been made. Agreement has been approached on Eric Johnston's Jordan water-development plan. But obviously a great deal more constructive work still needs to be done.

#### THE PROBLEM OF FOREIGN POLICY AND NOVEMBER 1956

This, then, for brief summary purposes, must be our general outline of the situation in Europe.

In the few moments which are remaining to me I should like to say just a few words with regard to the relations here at home between the two political parties over our foreign policy.

No one need remind you that in this crucial election year of 1956 it is inevitable that both parties may, to some extent, try to use foreign-policy arguments to their own advantage.

It is inevitable that the Eisenhower administration will "hold with pride," and that some of our Democratic friends may tend to "view with alarm."

It has been my hope (indeed it has been the hope, I believe, of most thinking Americans) that we can keep partisan disputes on foreign policy to an absolute minimum.

We must keep the argument to manageable proportions. We must not allow foreign policy to be completely dragged into the political arena, where it might be kicked around to such an extent that America's prestige declines throughout the world.

The eyes of all mankind are upon us. Our friends are not slow to note our shortcomings, and our enemies are quick to seize upon our shortcomings.

#### GENERALIZED CRITICISM OF FOREIGN POLICY

Now, let me say just a word with regard to some of the criticisms which have been leveled against our foreign policy.

One quickly notes that one uniform characteristic of these criticisms is that they have really been confined to generalities and not to specifics.

Occasionally the criticisms become specific. One example is the hindsight possibility that we might have become involved in the Indo-Chinese fighting at the Communist siege of Dien Bien Phu.

Well, a lot of things might theoretically have happened in the past and a lot of things might theoretically happen in the future. This is a world of alternative risks and dangers. We could spend time indefinitely discussing risks which we took in the past or alternatives which we might have taken, but didn't.

#### THE SURPLUS OF ABSTRACT ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBS

Basically, however, as you read most of the Democrats' criticisms, you will see that generally our Democratic friends merely say, in a completely unspecific way, that our foreign policy is "not clear enough." And they use dozens of other abstract adjectives and adverbs as well.

When you try to pin them down, when you try to ask them for their own constructive counterproposals, when you ask them what they would actually do, differently than what we are not doing now, there is a comparative silence. I say "comparative," because silence is not a noun generally associated with the Democratic Party. Basically the Democrats do not really have specific alternative plans to the ones which the Eisenhower administration is now following. The Democrats want us to achieve all of these "lovely" adjective goals which they set forth—flexibly, dynamic, etc.—but they do not tell us how—concretely.

Let me assure you that I, for one, very definitely want our foreign policy to be clear, dynamic, flexible, and so forth.

But I believe that right now it basically does strive for these objectives. And I believe that no two people are working harder for those goals than are Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles.

#### DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATIONS ESTABLISHED PRESENT OUTLINES

Lest my position be misinterpreted, let me quickly state that this Nation is indebted to the previous Democratic administrations for the broad outline of leading policies which have proven successful in Europe and emphasized in Europe.

This Nation is indebted to an ex-Secretary of State like Gen. George C. Marshall, who recently observed his 75th birthday. And it is indebted to other men of great stature who served this Republic well in the field of foreign relations during the long period of Democratic occupancy of the White House and control of the Congress.

It is my hope that, thanks to the great talent and ability of both major parties, we will continue to make a success of our policies in Europe, as well as in Asia, and elsewhere.

#### PRINCIPAL THREAT TODAY IN ASIA

In my judgment, the principal Soviet threat today is not in Europe. It is in the Asian theater, where conditions of colonialism, of widespread poverty, illiteracy, and disease provide ripe opportunities for communist intrigue. About this we shall hear more from our good friend from Minnesota.

#### CONCLUSION

It has been a great pleasure to be with you tonight, and I look forward to the opportunity to respond to your questions.

## Address by the Vice President on the 250th Anniversary of the Birth of Benjamin Franklin

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last evening the Vice President delivered an excellent address before the golden anniversary dinner of the Poor Richard Club in Philadelphia on the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin. I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's address may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY DINNER OF THE POOR RICHARD CLUB, BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., JANUARY 17, 1956

This is a very special occasion for me for several reasons:

Because I am privileged to share with you the 250th anniversary of the birth of the most versatile, the most complete man in our history, Benjamin Franklin.

Because, at the same time, I share also the golden anniversary of this club, which bears a name which both Dr. Franklin and my mother thought well of.

Because you have so highly honored me by allowing me to join the distinguished group of men and women who have received your gold-medal award in years gone by.

In accepting the award may I suggest that it could have more appropriately been presented to many others, but particularly to one who is in this audience. The citation speaks generously of the contribution to good will and understanding I may have made in serving in my present office. May I be permitted to tell you a little story at this point.

When we returned from our two-and-a-half-months' trip to Asia in December 1953, the President and Mrs. Eisenhower very generously invited us to the White House upon our arrival. As we were sitting in the White House apartment on the second floor enjoying a cup of tea, the President turned to me and said, "I've had some good reports on you, Dick, on this trip." And then he turned to Mrs. Nixon and said, "But the reports on you, Pat, have been wonderful."

Now Benjamin Franklin was a most gallant man. As you recall, on being chided by a lady as to why he had not come to call, he replied, "Madam, I am waiting until the nights are longer." I am sure he would agree that this club would have done better to honor the lady rather than the man to-night. In that spirit, then, I accept this award with humility and gratitude.

And now I embark on one of the most difficult tasks which could confront a speaker.

To speak on Benjamin Franklin before this group is like carrying coals to Newcastle. Or, as Foreign Minister Shigemitsu of Japan, put it when he was here a few months ago, like carrying Sake to Nada. You have had distinguished speakers galore tell you again and again of Franklin's life, his achievements, his priceless anecdotes.

But I should like to consider this versatile man Franklin tonight in his role as a public man and a public servant. Because in addition to his many better-known talents he was a superb political operator. He



was a businessman who recognized the importance of politics and public service. He was a governor. He was our first Postmaster General. He was our first Ambassador to a foreign country.

I, of course, would like to claim that he was the first Republican, but the terms "Democrat" and "Republican" in the sense we think of them today were not known to him. I am sure, however, that it would not be inaccurate to state that he was a moderate.

And since leading figures in both political parties see the merits of moderation today, that makes any praise of Franklin which I intend to indulge in completely bipartisan in character.

We have only to read the concluding sentence of his famous speech to the Constitutional Convention which had such a great impact on that historic body to find the true guide lines for moderation.

"I cannot help expressing the wish that every member of the Convention who may still have objections to it, would with me on this occasion doubt a little of his infallibility and to make manifest our unanimity put his name to this instrument."

No one could read or hear these words without agreeing that Franklin was in truth a moderate in the best sense of the word.

Let us now see what advice this infinitely wise man might have for us on the great issues which confront our Government today.

We do not have to look far to find what his position would have been on national defense. It was Franklin who said:

"The very fame of our strength and readiness would be a means of discouraging our enemies, for 'tis a wise and true saying that one sword often keeps another in the scabbard. The way to secure peace is to be prepared for war."

And I can assure you that we are following Franklin's advice today in our national policy.

Today America's military strength, combined with that of our allies, is greater than it has ever been in war or peace. We can, if necessary, with our allies meet and defeat any aggressor who dares to launch an attack.

And I am sure that the great majority of the American people will agree when I say that as long as a malignant aggressive force threatens the peace of the world, the understandable desire we all share for cutting our taxes and balancing our budget must never be allowed to compromise our judgment as to the necessary level of our military strength during this period of international tension.

Franklin also, even in those early days of the Republic, was a full-blown, practical internationalist in every sense of the word. It is true that his famous statement, "We must indeed hang together or assuredly we shall all hang separately," was made in reference to the American Colonies and not with regard to the United States' relations with other countries, but other statements show the trend of his thinking. With amazing foresight, he virtually predicted NATO and the United Nations.

And there is no doubt whatever but that he would have been a strong proponent of reducing barriers to trade between nations and of providing foreign aid when the interests of the United States as well as the countries aided would be served. It was he who said:

"I am sorry to find that that wisdom which sees the welfare of the parts in the prosperity of the whole seems not yet to be known in this country. We are so far from conceiving that what is best for mankind, or even for Europe in general, may be best for us."

I can imagine that if Franklin were here today he might have given us a new definition of an internationalist. I submit one on his behalf. "An internationalist is a nation-

alist who recognizes that in the final analysis what is good for our friends abroad is good for the United States, and what is bad for them is bad for us."

In line with this definition, may I at this point say some things about foreign economic aid which I think very desperately need to be said and understood by the American people? What I say now has not been cleared with the White House or with the Department of State, but it represents my own personal estimate of a deadly danger which confronts the United States and the free world.

We seldom have any difficulty in arousing the American people to the necessity of providing men and arms to defend the frontiers of our allies against armed aggression. Korea was a prime example of this truth.

And I am sure that if the Soviet Union were to launch an armed attack against Indonesia, Afghanistan, Syria, India—any of the countries of the Far East, Near East, or Africa—the people of the United States would realize that such an attack endangered our own security and would take appropriate action to meet it.

The reason we are so ready to take up arms and send our men to fight on foreign shores is that we recognize that if a potential enemy is allowed to overrun either free or neutral countries our own world position is weakened and we eventually will be next on the list.

What we must realize today is that sinister new means have been developed by the Communists for taking over countries without ever launching armed attack across a border.

Since World War II the Communist conspiracy has added 600 million people and a quarter of the earth's territory to the area which it dominates. The significant fact about this accomplishment is that the gains were made without the loss of a single Russian soldier in combat.

What it adds up to is that the major danger the free world faces today is not defeat in hot war but defeat in cold war—a cold war in which potential enemies undeterred by any moral restraint use political, economic, psychological and other tactics which are just as effective in taking over territory as armed aggression—and much less costly. This is the way the Communist nations operate.

We hear today a chorus of opposition to the so-called "giveaway foreign aid programs" while at the same time we find virtually no opposition to programs which build up our armed strength at home and that of our allies abroad.

But if we examine the problem realistically we will find that the men in the Kremlin are waging not only a great ideological offensive against the free world but a very subtle and economic offensive as well—an offensive in which they are attacking what they think are the weak spots of the neutralist and the free world with offers of economic aid.

They are not making these offers because of any highly developed sense of philanthropy. The realistic men in Moscow know that a country which becomes an economic satellite will inevitably become a political and military satellite as well.

Our foreign aid program is not designed to buy the friendship of peoples in the countries to which our aid is given. That is why both neutrals and allies should share in that program.

What we are trying to do is to shore up their strength so that they can be free economically and politically of any foreign domination—so that they can be independent members of the family of nations. This in the final analysis is the best guaranty of our own freedom and our own independence.

An economic offensive is potentially just as dangerous and in some ways more dangerous than a military offensive which might be launched against us or one of our allies.

If we want to keep our freedom and our independence we must recognize this threat and deal with it imaginatively, boldly, and effectively.

I am sure that Franklin who, in speaking of the benefits of peace, said, "What vast additions to the conveniences and comforts of living might mankind have acquired if the money spent in wars had been employed in works of public utility," would have approved wholeheartedly of President Eisenhower's conduct at the Geneva Big Four Conference.

He would have recognized that the millions of the world's people want peace and he would have argued the necessity and rightness of his country being on the side of peace.

And the Geneva Conference which for the first time since World War II got the United States off the defensive and on the offensive on the great issue of peace and did so without one concession of liberty or territory would in Franklin's judgment have been considered a memorable success.

But the man who said, "There never was a good war, or a bad peace," would certainly not have been an appeaser. We must remember that he was a revolutionary leader. It was he who said, "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." Surely we can find no better guideline for our conduct in the world conflict which engulfs us today.

He would have been proud to have read and heard the statement the President made recently on the subject of the captive countries. "The peaceful liberation of the captive peoples has been, is, and until success is achieved, will continue to be a major goal of United States foreign policy."

In summary, I rather imagine that Franklin would have approved wholeheartedly of President Eisenhower's recent statement—"We must wage peace with our eyes open, our heads cool, and our tempers well under control, yielding neither to Soviet threats or Communist blandishments in our crusade for a free, peaceful, and prosperous world."

I believe too that Franklin would undoubtedly have approved of good will trips of every type and description. He was himself a man of infinite good will, beloved in every country to which his journeys took him.

And it was he who uttered these eloquent words, "I think it cannot but have a good effect in promoting a certain interest too little thought of by selfish man, and scarcely ever mentioned, so that we hardly have a name for it; I mean the interest of humanity, or common good of mankind."

I personally again can testify to the truth of his statement. It has been my privilege to visit 30 countries in the past 3 years and I have no doubt whatever but that as people know each other the prejudices which otherwise would drive them apart will inevitably melt away. I had heard before I visited these countries how different the people of each nation I was to visit were. These people were supposed to be reserved, others were supposed to be arrogant, others were anti-American.

But I found that while there were differences in food, religion, customs, and languages, a smile, a handshake, a friendly gesture, got the same reaction abroad as in the United States. That was true everywhere we went in Asia. And, in Latin America my memories are full of gestures of good will.

And may I say that one of the reasons I am particularly moved by receiving this medal tonight is that this organization recognized the importance and the contribution



that can be made by public officials when they go abroad offering no treaties, no arms, no economic concessions, but simply an abundance of American good will.

This very practical man would have had some appropriate comments on some of our more mundane but nevertheless important domestic problems.

I am confident that the subject on the domestic scene which would have fascinated him the most would be the current controversy which is developing over automation. There are a number of reasons for this conclusion.

Franklin invented all types of labor-saving devices. A machine to copy letters. A long arm for taking down books from high shelves. A rocking-chair with an attachment which caused a fan above the chair to move rhythmically back and forth cooling the sitter and shooing the flies.

He was a man who valued time more than any man in history. It was he who said, "Lose no time, be always employed in something useful, cut off all unnecessary action."

He even carried his passion for saving time to extremes which might not be approved in some quarters. He noticed that it always took a considerable time for his father to ask the blessing at the dinner table. He studied the situation and came up with this ingenious idea. He suggested to his father that he could bless all the food in the barrels at one time and thus save the time of blessing each portion of it at the table.

Rather than engaging in gloomy predictions as to unemployment and dislocation which might be caused by further automation, he would probably have pointed out these salient facts:

There has been no significant rise in unemployment in these days when automation is increasing.

On the contrary, employment, wages, and income for America's workers are the highest in history.

There is no appreciable unemployment in those industries in which automation is furthest advanced: chemical, electrical, communications, and automobiles.

And looking to the future he would have noted these facts:

Today the labor force includes approximately 42 percent of our population.

By 1965, it is estimated that it will be less than 38 percent of our population at that time.

On the other hand, the number of non-productive persons will have increased from 34 percent of the population to over 49 percent in the same period.

These percentage figures are based on a projection by the Bureau of the Census which indicates that by 1965 the total population of the United States will increase about 25 millions while at the same time the number of persons aged 26 to 64 will increase by only 8 millions.

This brings us to an inevitable conclusion. The only way to make up this growing difference between the relative number of workers and consumers is by better management of the Nation's productive resources. It will not be enough to go on doing as well as we have done. We will have to do much better, and that means we will have to have much more automation.

I am sure Franklin would have gloried in this situation. He would have seen that here is truly a new frontier for America, and, with that gentle humor of his which always glowed but never seared, he would have laughed out of court the prophets of doom, the reactionaries who see such grave consequences in this new vista of progress for America and the world.

All in all, considering the manifold problems of the diverse regions, groups and

interests in America, we can be sure that Franklin above all would have been a true statesman. It was he who said, "To serve the public faithfully, and at the same time please it entirely is impracticable."

I think that he would have been immensely proud of another man of good will, one of whose actions I would like to describe briefly to you now.

This is an incident which occurred in a Cabinet meeting. It is not necessary to identify the bill involved or the people involved because this incident is so typical of the man who heads our Nation today. A question arose as to whether he should veto a bill if it passed Congress. Though the bill would cost several millions more than everybody in the President's Cabinet believed should be appropriated for the particular purpose, one of those present urged that he not veto the bill on the ground that history showed that vetoes by previous Presidents of such bills had proved to be politically damaging because of the political power of the group favoring the bill.

The President looked him straight in the eye and said: "I have studied the history of such bills also and I agree that in the short run such veto action may have been politically unwise. But I have always found in my life that you never get into trouble in the long run doing what is right, and I am not going to be black-jacked by any group in America to do something which I do not think is in the best interests of all the American people."

I am sure that Benjamin Franklin would say that this kind of statesmanship which we have learned to expect from our great Presidents, both Republicans and Democrats, is what has made America the great country it is today.

Of course, I realize that up to this time I have not commented upon the major political question of the day, and I must admit that even Franklin on this subject appears to be somewhat inconsistent. On the one hand he said, "The first mistake in public business is the going into it." But then again he said, "I shall never ask, never refuse, or never resign an office."

All that I can say is that I know that 32 million Republicans and Democrats who voted for President Eisenhower are hoping and praying that he will see fit to follow the advice Franklin gave in the second quotation rather than the first.

Finally, tonight, I think that your great Philadelphia philosopher would have had little advice for me.

A careful reading of most of what he said unfortunately shows no direct advice to public speakers. But after reading and rereading source materials, I finally ran across this gem: "It is ill manners to silence a fool, and cruelty to let him go on."

Now I don't mean by this quotation that Franklin meant that all Vice Presidents and/or orators are fools. And I know the members of the Poor Richard Club in this City of Brotherly Love could never be cruel or rude.

But I do know that Franklin, a man who loved life, good humor, and good fellowship, with the knowledge of the delightful entertainment that is to follow the speaking part of this program, would say, "Anyone who talks any longer at this point is a fool."

So may I conclude my remarks by saying to you again—

Thank you for the honor you have conferred upon me through your award.

Thank you for the privilege of allowing Mrs. Nixon and me to share this historical event with you.

And may the years ahead for each of you be filled with the wisdom, the good humor, the great humanity with which the creator of Poor Richard was so abundantly blessed.

## Speaker Rayburn Lends Power of His Voice to Public Shock and Alarm Following Disclosure of Brink of War Philosophy and Practice on the Part of Secretary Dulles—Calls It Pitiful Performance

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, many millions of alarmed American citizens—as well as many of our allies—are reading today with relief and gratification that the calm, reasonable, and powerful voice of our distinguished Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, has been raised in condemnation of the suddenly disclosed brink-of-war philosophy which, it seems, is being practiced by our State Department; at least it has been practiced, by his own admission, by the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles.

Speaker RAYBURN, in a press conference statement on yesterday, called Mr. Dulles' practiced brink-of-war philosophy a pitiful performance and many will find themselves in complete agreement. For my own part, I can see only one bright result coming out of Mr. Dulles' self-praiseworthy disclosure of his diplomatic tactics—and that is, that having revealed his tricks of the trade to an appalled world, Mr. Dulles may find them impossible for successful practice further in the future.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include excerpts from the report of Mr. RAYBURN's press conference statement, as written for the New York Times by Mr. William S. White, in the RECORD.

The excerpts follow:

RAYBURN ASSAILS STAND BY DULLES—HOUSE SPEAKER SCORES PITIFUL PERFORMANCE AND CHARGES PERIL TO UNITED STATES ALLIANCES (By William S. White)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—House Speaker SAM RAYBURN added his power today to Democratic attacks on Secretary of State Dulles.

As Mr. RAYBURN broadened Democratic charges of election-year irresponsibility against the Secretary of State, President Eisenhower coincidentally asked Congress to grant him the right to pledge foreign economic aid for some time into the future.

The Speaker \*\*\* accused Mr. Dulles of a "pitiful performance." Mr. RAYBURN said the Secretary had endangered the United States' alliances by a statement in an interview in Life magazine that the administration's diplomatic skill had saved the peace after the Nation had walked "to the brink of war."

Speaker RAYBURN's denunciation of Secretary Dulles was of unusual significance.

It was the first instance in which a member of the Democratic congressional leadership had joined what had heretofore been rank-and-file criticism of Mr. Dulles over the "brink of war" statement, which appeared in an interview in Life magazine.



Mr. RAYBURN's action was one of the rare times he had assailed the administration on foreign policy since President Eisenhower took office in 1953.

The Speaker asserted at a press conference that Mr. Dulles' interview was likely to lose friends abroad who were needed by the United States more than ever.

"That [the article] may be a satisfactory thing for Mr. Dulles," Mr. RAYBURN declared, "but it is a pretty dangerous performance for the country. All in all, the article and Mr. Dulles' quotes in it were a pitiful performance."

"The brink of anything is too close for me. I think we need friends now more than we ever needed them. I fear that by a performance like this we may have fewer of them in the future than we have now."

### "Do Big Oil Companies High-Pressure Local Gas Stations?"

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, October 15, 1955:

Greetings. In the maze of congressional activity the evidence developed through some hearings and investigations does not receive the attention that it deserves.

Take the case of Pete, who runs the gas station around the block. We may drive the many cars in his neighborhood, but he is the one who provides the services that enable them to run.

Pete is a pleasant man, who seems to delight in waiting on us.

Even though he is kept busy all of his long day, in his little supply office, at the gas pumps, or under the hoist.

Pete is a small-business man.

We know that he works hard, but we figure he enjoys the fact that he is independent.

There are some 200,000 others just like him, who lease their stations from the major oil companies.

Offhand, Pete would seem to be far removed from the great national and international issues that come before the Congress of the United States for study, debate, and decision.

Pete, however, has his own special problems.

Being a small operator, and dependent upon his big suppliers, there is always the danger that he will be subjected to power pressures.

After receiving many complaints, the Small Business Committee of the United States House of Representatives authorized an investigation.

Subcommittee No. 5, under the chairmanship of Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, held numerous hearings concerning alleged coercive and discriminatory practices used by oil company suppliers against retail gasoline operators.

Sixty-four witnesses were heard.

Thirty-one were retail gasoline-station operators.

Fifteen were retail gasoline trade association officers or attorneys.

Twelve were officials of oil company suppliers mentioned in the testimony, or retail operators of the company who testified on behalf of company policy and practices.

In addition, the subcommittee accepted for the record, statements presented under oath in affidavit form.

On the basis of the testimony, the subcommittee reached the following conclusions:

1. A substantial proportion of all sales of refined gasoline of major oil companies to the general public is made through retail outlets where the dealer has a short-term lease from the oil company supplier, usually for 1 year. The importance and the proportion of the total retail market serviced by such short-term lessee dealers has been increasing.

2. The dealer operating his station under a short-term lease with the oil company supplier, oftentimes is not independent and is subject to control by the oil company supplier.

3. The short-term leases and sales practices of major oil companies in relation to sponsored products have had the effect of operating against a dealer's freedom of choice in using or dealing in competitive products, and operate to substantially lessen competition and tend to eliminate price competition.

4. Price discrimination: oil company suppliers have held the level of their prices generally while at the same time cutting their prices to one or more dealers at a particular location. In such situations, the lower price has prevailed until the low price, off-brand dealer saw fit to increase his price. This policy or practice has had the immediate effect of fomenting price wars among the retail dealers, and results ultimately in eliminating a substantial amount of price competition between and among both brand and off-brand gasoline. Moreover, short-term lessee dealers in many instances have been coerced or induced by their oil company suppliers into so-called price wars in an effort to secure the business enjoyed by the low-price off-brand dealer. It was also established that on occasion price wars have been started when some dealers engaged in price-cutting activities on their own initiative.

5. The lessee dealer needs immediate and permanent relief to enable him to fulfill his role as an independent businessman.

Let's take some testimony at random.

A lessee dealer in Manchester, Ga., testified company representatives told him that he had to abide by the policies of the big oil company and that they had a quota of TBA products (tires, batteries, accessories) to meet. His station had to meet this quota and that they were going to do it one way or another.

Despite these threats, the dealer refused to purchase the required items. Shortly thereafter his lease was canceled pursuant to a 10-day notice provision. Forced to move from the station all equipment and stock other than the oil company's products, the dealer suffered a loss of approximately \$1,500.

Another dealer in Rockville, Md., testified as to pressure, both as to one big oil company's TBA products, and the retail price of its gasoline as posted. Because of this pressure, he was forced to take a competitive brand of tires out of his station and hide them in another location although he felt that the competitive brand tires were cheaper and had a stronger guaranty than the company-sponsored tires.

Detroit, Mich., lessee testified that he was told by a company representative "to get out of his station all merchandise competitive with the company's TBA items. Following his refusal to do so, his lease was not renewed, and he stated that company representatives told him one of the reasons for the refusal was that he did not sell enough TBA items and lubricants."

A Johnstown, Pa., lessee testified that another big oil company's salesman—"caught me with two winter tires manufactured by

a competitor which I had bought on special request for a good customer. The salesman told me that if I could not adhere to the policies of my supplier, he would put someone in my station who would. Every time he wasn't too well pleased with my oil or gas sales, displays, or hours, he would tell me about the fellows in training at the big company's station, who would replace me on short notice."

This dealer was canceled out of his station on December 24, 1954, the company refusing to buy its own brand stock in his inventory.

A Seattle, Wash., lessee testified: " \* \* \* That there was one point my big company supplier made very clear, that you do carry their complete line \* \* \* I carried this line for one reason, to try and keep peace with them. Even though I don't like their complete line of merchandise."

He further testified that he could have bought the same TBA items he purchased through the company distributor, at a cheaper price from an independent jobber.

The effect of the heretofore described practices of certain oil companies upon the free competitive economy, was brought forth in the testimony of officers of the 'Blank' Oil Company of California. Its president said that his company sold its oil strictly through independent dealers. With reference to motorcar and repair shop dealers, the company was able to sell to approximately 75 percent of such dealers. With reference to service-station dealers, it was only able to sell to approximately 35 percent of the total number of such dealers. Of the 35 percent of the retail gasoline station dealers who did purchase the 'Blank' Co.'s oil, a majority would not display this product, but kept it hidden.

This official states that: "In many instances our delivery truck cannot even deliver to their place of business. They are afraid they will be caught by the major company representative, and so we deliver oil and it is written right on the order that our delivery truck carries it to a man's home, or to a small independent business alongside of him with whom he is friendly. Our oil is stored in the back of automobiles, is stored in locked-up cabinets, in restaurants \* \* \* it is stored where the major gasoline company representative is not likely to find it."

A substantial part of the complaints of retail operators dealt with alleged coercive and discriminatory practices of the major oil companies in relation to the retail price of gasoline.

As one off-brand dealer testified: "Nobody can afford it when a major oil company deliberately goes out and subsidizes a station. Well, the intent is so obvious, in my opinion; it is for no other purpose than to force me out of business, or force me to 'up' the price so that they can dictate the price I can sell at."

The oil companies testified that discounts are given to "meet competition." It is significant when the off-brand station is forced to raise its price to the 2-cent differential, that the discounts are withdrawn, the price war ends overnight, and retail prices return either to their former or a higher level. The evidence therefore, is to the effect that the oil companies concept of "meeting competition" involves a practice which results in the isolation, and then the destruction, of competition.

As a result of these hearings, the subcommittee recommended that:

1. The antimonopoly laws designed to protect and preserve small and independent business enterprises as necessary to our free and competitive enterprise system, should be strengthened.

2. That all oil company suppliers consider liberalization of their policies regarding leases with retail dealers.



3. That the full House Select Committee on Small Business continue and expand its study of the problems of the small-business men in the petroleum and other industries who are dependent upon large suppliers.

4. That the record of the hearings be forwarded to the antitrust division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. With the intent that these agencies (a) consider the utilization of existing laws to the extent possible to eliminate the harmful practices shown in the record and the committee's report, and (b) to report to Congress those areas in which existing laws are not adequate to achieve relief, and what further legislation is necessary in order to achieve comprehensive and permanent relief.

Filling station owners should not be forced to carry certain tires, batteries, and other accessories which the big oil companies want carried, whether the neighborhood or roadside dealer wants them or not. Legislation will be proposed to divorce oil companies from the retail business, just as motion-picture production has been separated from motion-picture exhibition.

Retail trade is the last stronghold of little business.

It must be protected from the high-handed pressures of monopolies.

**Hon. John Phillips of California—  
Hon. Ezra Taft Benson**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. LEROY JOHNSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 18, 1956*

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include two short articles published in the California Farmer, one of the best agricultural papers in California, about my colleague, JOHN PHILLIPS, and also an article in the same publication and in the same issue about Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

JOHN PHILLIPS came to Congress at the same time I became a Member of the House. He is an able legislator and is especially versed in agricultural problems because he has been a member of the same committee in the California State senate.

Just what Mr. PHILLIPS will do after he has left Congress no one knows, perhaps not even himself. But whatever it may be I am sure that he will be engaged in some useful work, perhaps writing.

I am a great admirer of Mr. Benson. He knows what he is doing and I predict that he will outlast all his detractors. He is dedicated to the job of developing a sensible and reasonable agricultural support program and I am positive that he will accomplish his purpose. Intelligence, courage and determination can conquer almost any obstacles and since he has all these attributes I feel certain that he will bring the present agricultural situation out of chaos.

The articles referred to follow:

**JOHN PHILLIPS TO RETIRE**

Representative JOHN PHILLIPS of the 29th district, representing Riverside and Imperial Counties, has decided not to run again. He retires after 24 years of public life.

We have always had great respect for JOHN PHILLIPS. A handsome, composed man with a good head on his shoulders. He has represented the farmer well and with understanding.

JOHN PHILLIPS writes a newsletter home, periodically, that is in our estimation some of the best writing coming out of Washington, and that includes all the syndicated columnists. Someone should induce John to stay on in Washington as a columnist.

We were impressed with the way PHILLIPS announced his intention of withdrawing. He said that he did not intend to run again next year. That he had no picked candidate and did not intend to take part in the primary campaign of 1956.

Furthermore, he offered to sit down with anybody during the next 13 months who thought he might want to run for the job, and try to outline to him just what the job of being a Representative in the Congress of the United States entailed.

Also, John is going to try in the remaining newsletters he sends home to define that job in some detail. We just hope the next person does as good a job as JOHN PHILLIPS has done.

**THE JOB WHERE YOU CAN'T WIN**

We see by the papers that a California public relations firm has been retained by the Republican Party to help humanize Secretary Benson. We suppose that all facets of the political diamond are being polished but it is painfully evident that no longer can a man stand on his record.

Our mail tells us that not all farmers in this State are happy with the record of Mr. Benson, but we also know the same would have been true if Davy Crockett had been Secretary of Agriculture during the term of this administration.

It is also evident that a man cannot go to Washington and do the job without mixing in a generous amount of politicking, but imagine the necessity of hiring a firm to make someone like you better.

We have met Benson and found him a charming personality. Evidently he is of the old school that thinks if you devote all your time to the job and do the best you are capable of, you have fulfilled your commitment. Sad to say, that is no longer the case in Washington. You have to waste a great deal of time in the social whirl and spend a great deal of time shaking hands, being seen with the right people, and placating the thin-skinned.

In our humble opinion, agriculture got into her present mess through a bipartisan vote-in of Socialist experimental legislation. The aim to stimulate production worked wonderfully well. The money stimulus combined with an unprecedented era of mechanization, fertilizer advancements, chemical miracles for control of pests and diseases and plant breeding, with the result that double jackpots were hit for years in succession.

Meantime the socialistic experiments had obliterated the true market place and practically repealed the law of supply and demand for some of our basic crops. This encouraged foreign competition. We were afraid of offending anyone in the world market, and agriculture lagged behind the rest of the economy with a depressing inventory of surplus goods. The socialistic tinkering threw out of gear the natural agricultural cycles. After offering the political candy of subsidies, politicians of both parties were afraid to withdraw the sweet bait for fear of losing votes.

People write us and blame Benson for their troubles. It's nice to have a whipping boy but in our estimation the Secretary is being accorded extraordinary powers when you blame your entire plight on him alone.

It will take the President, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, and Con-

gress in concert to solve this farm problem or even to influence the economic status of the farmer to any marked degree. It is evident that both parties are a little bankrupt of ideas on how to meet the farm problem. Note that the Secretary has sent out an appeal to all citizens to submit ideas on the problem.

**M. L. Benedum: The Oilman of the  
Century**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. EDWARD MARTIN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, January 18, 1956*

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it was my privilege on October 12 last to take part in honoring a great American whose distinguished achievements have brought him worldwide fame. On that occasion, in the city of Pittsburgh, I had the pleasant task of presenting to Mr. M. L. Benedum a plaque designating him as the oilman of the century.

This was a proper and richly deserved tribute paid to Mr. Benedum by the Allegheny County Oil Industry in its observance of Oil Progress Week.

It was a testimonial of love and respect for a man whose vision, courage, and rugged individualism have made him famous as the "King of the Wildcatters."

His outstanding career renews our faith in the traditional American system of free enterprise. It was that system which caused men like Mike Benedum to go into all parts of the earth in search of oil to lighten the burdens of humanity and to stimulate progress for world betterment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks in presenting the plaque to Mr. Benedum, and also his most inspiring words of acceptance.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, IN PRESENTING TO M. L. BENEDUM A PLAQUE DESIGNATING HIM AS THE OILMAN OF THE CENTURY AT THE OIL PROGRESS DINNER OF THE ALLEGHENY COUNTY OIL INDUSTRY INFORMATION COMMITTEE, IN THE WILLIAM PENN HOTEL, PITTSBURGH, OCTOBER 12, 1955

It is always a pleasure to join in honoring a distinguished American for outstanding achievement.

It is a proud part of our American heritage that a long list of men of humble origin have led this Nation to great heights.

That is the essence of American progress. It is made possible by freedom of the individual, strengthened by freedom of enterprise and supported by individual responsibility.

Reward for individual effort is the foundation of the greatness of our economic system. It is the right of every American to acquire and own property and to enjoy the fruits of his labor, energy, and initiative.

This concept of individual freedom, written into our fundamental law, made America a land of opportunity. It holds out to the youth of our land equal opportunity to reach the highest place in every activity that upholds the American way of life.



Our paramount obligation as free citizens of our great Republic is to keep it that way. It is our responsibility to keep alive the freedoms and the opportunities that have made the United States the greatest Nation on earth. It is up to us to leave to future generations the same kind of America that we have been privileged to enjoy.

The man we honor tonight is a brilliant product of those priceless American assets—freedom of the individual and freedom of enterprise.

By his own efforts, without social or economic advantages, he reached the pinnacle of success in the toughest and most hazardous form of industrial enterprise—the search for oil.

Those of us who have followed his brilliant career have some knowledge of the great personal and financial risks involved.

We know of the dangers and the hardships that are encountered by those who venture into the most inaccessible places of the world in the hope that oil might be found. We know of the disappointments and discouragements that are part of this extremely uncertain business.

Those were some of the obstacles that gave way before the vision and driving energy of our guest of honor. Every new venture differed from the other. Every one brought new and more difficult problems to be solved.

But determination, resourcefulness, and hard work won out and in 60 years of wildcatting M. L. Benedum has brought in more producing oil wells from wildcat territory than any other man in history.

We honor him tonight because his rugged individualism will live as an inspiration to generations far into the future.

In him are represented all the finest elements of our national strength and character—faith, vision, courage, integrity, hard work and devotion to the public welfare.

We do not measure the worth of an individual by the dollars he has accumulated, but rather by his service to his fellow man. In that respect I can find no better example than his own words which sum up the noble philosophy by which he lives.

Last July, when interviewed by newspaper reporters on his 86th birthday, Mr. Benedum said and I quote:

"I have always felt that I am merely a trustee of money and that it is my responsibility to use it in the public interest."

No words of mine are adequate to express our high regard for Mr. Benedum. Nor is it necessary for me to dwell at length on the love and esteem in which he is held by this group of his warmest admirers.

He has richly earned all our praise and gratitude and it is a high privilege, on behalf of the Allegheny County Oil Industry, to present to you, Sir, Mr. Benedum, this plaque which rightfully and properly designates you as the "Oilman of the Century."

REPLY OF MR. M. L. BENEDUM ACCEPTING PLAQUE DESIGNATING HIM AS THE "OILMAN OF THE CENTURY"

Mr. Toastmaster, Senator MARTIN, ladies, and gentlemen, I am indeed grateful to this fine group of the oil fraternity for the honor you have conferred upon me, and for this beautiful plaque. I am also grateful to this truly great American, Senator MARTIN, for his gracious and generous remarks.

I have been in the oil business for 65 years and sometimes I feel that I have not learned too much about it, but I have learned a lot about the people in it. In the early days many of the men in the oil business were real diamonds in the rough. Underneath, however, they had honor, integrity, and a high sense of dignity. They respected their obligations, they kept their word, they tried to improve the lot of their more unfortunate fellow men. In short, they lived up to the highest concept of Christian citizenship.

There have been great changes in the business since I started in it, but the oil man still retains those traits which mark the real measure of a man. His word is still his bond. He still believes that a man's wealth is calculated in terms of the confidence and respect of his fellow men rather than in dollars.

Please believe me when I say to you I would rather have the confidence and respect of the men and women of the oil industry than of any other group on earth.

Science and invention to a great extent have pointed the way to all of the progress of the last century so we must give much credit to the scientific men. It is their genius that has sparked the fantastic progress in oil as well as in all American business.

As an oil man, I am proud that our industry has more than kept pace with the industrial revolution. It has been out front most of the time, blazing a trail for the others to follow. There is scarcely a single thing that has been developed in the last 50 years that has not required oil to help in its completion and in many cases it is necessary to use it for its operation. (Take for instance the auto, the aeroplane, and all kinds and characters of machinery that we use daily.) In fact, as I see it, oil is the mainspring of our industrial life. Did you ever stop to think that the economic and social progress of the last 75 years has been in direct ratio to the consumption of oil? The more oil people use—the better they live.

I often wonder what would happen in the world if oil should be suddenly taken from us.

If it were given me to live my life over, I would still want to be an oilman. I am grateful to providence that either through lucky chance or divine guidance I became an oil man.

Several days ago, a Washington newspaper man asked me how I, at 86 years of age, occupied my time. I replied, "I expect to pass through this life but once: I have already lived 16 years beyond the allotted time; I have lived to see most of my associates and loved ones leave; therefore, I now live for those left whom I love; I live for the tasks which God has assigned to me, and for the good that I may be able to do for others."

Again, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the honor you have conferred upon me tonight. I shall always cherish this beautiful plaque and the memory of this pleasant occasion. God bless you and good night.

### Eisenhower in Milwaukee—Let's Have the Complete Record

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, recently the members of this House have been favored by several insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of substantial portions of the memorable speech made by General Eisenhower in Milwaukee, Wis., on October 3, 1952. This was the time when the Republican presidential candidate expressed so eloquently his views on the problem of communism and freedom in the United States.

I am glad that these remarks by Mr. Eisenhower have again been brought to

public attention. I am glad, not only as a proud citizen of Milwaukee, but as one who believes it is sound and instructive, as a new presidential campaign gets under way, to have everything which has been said on this vital subject spread again upon the public record.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it would serve us all best if the complete record of the remarks which Mr. Eisenhower prepared for that important address were brought to light. I am thinking of the paragraph concerning Gen. George C. Marshall which, according to press accounts, Mr. Eisenhower omitted when he actually delivered the speech.

It is a distinct loss to the public, and a disservice to the President, it seems to me, to omit that brief paragraph. I have never been so fortunate as to learn its exact words, but I have heard that it was a heartening defense of a gallant fellow soldier against the incredible charges made on the Senate floor that General Marshall had led a conspiracy to let the United States fall victim to Soviet intrigue.

Mr. Eisenhower apparently found it necessary to omit this passage when he spoke in Milwaukee, yet it is an integral and important part of his views as he originally composed them. In the interest of a complete record and a full presentation of Mr. Eisenhower's statement, it should be restored to its original place. I hope, therefore, that one of my colleagues who is fortunate enough to have secured the text of this tribute will wish to insert it in the RECORD.

For the record, too, it would be helpful also, I think, if we could be enlightened as to just why these sentences were removed from the Milwaukee text. In looking over the press reports, I found the New York Herald Tribune reporting as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of October 11, 1952]

During his talk with the reporters, General Eisenhower also sought to explain why he had deleted from his Milwaukee speech a four-line defense of General of the Army George C. Marshall, denounced by Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, as the unwitting dupe of a great Soviet conspiracy.

The General frankly admitted that he had cut the Marshall tribute from his speech after talking to Senator MCCARTHY in a hotel room in Peoria, Ill., the night before. However, he said he had not "censored" his own speech at the request of Senator MCCARTHY.

#### THOUGHT IT OUT OF PLACE

He did it, he said, because, first, he was guest of Gov. Walter J. Kohler, Jr., of Wisconsin, a MCCARTHY backer, and he thought it would be out of place to belabor Senator MCCARTHY in Wisconsin, and, second, he already had defended General Marshall. General Marshall knew exactly where General Eisenhower stood and had even sent him a note of gratitude, he added.

This seemed to be clear enough but then I found a different account. In the Washington Post and Times Herald, I read:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 12, 1954]

BOLTON LANDING, N. Y., July 11.—The real story of what happened in Wisconsin in the 1952 presidential campaign—how General Eisenhower agreed to delete from his pre-



pared speech a eulogy of Gen. George C. Marshall—was told here today.

It has often been said that Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, Republican, Wisconsin, persuaded General Eisenhower to drop what he proposed to say about General Marshall.

However, Gov. Walter J. Kohler told reporters today that it was he who was responsible, not McCARTHY. He told how he argued for elimination of the Marshall passage, first with Sherman Adams, and then in a meeting with General Eisenhower, Adams, and Maj. Gen. Wilton B. "Slick" Persons. This took place on the Eisenhower special train en route from Green Bay to Milwaukee, where the speech was to be delivered.

Governor Kohler, who is here attending the annual governors' conference, reminded newsmen that at the time General Eisenhower was in Wisconsin (early October) the outcome of the 1952 election was very much in doubt.

"So far as I was concerned," he said, "the most important thing in the world right then was the election of a Republican President. I had been shown a draft of General Eisenhower's speech. It was a defense of General Marshall against the charge of treason.

"I felt that General Eisenhower was a guest in our State, and that if he said what he planned to say it would be construed as an overt attack on McCARTHY. That wouldn't be good.

"I remember saying to Sherman Adams, 'When a man calls on the pope, he doesn't tell him what a fine fellow Martin Luther was.'"

Obviously, these two versions are inconsistent with each other. Can they not be promptly explained? Let us get the complete record straight for posterity.

## Review of United Nations Administrative, Personnel, and Budgetary Problems

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ALBERT P. MORANO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, during the recess our distinguished colleague and a hard-working, very able member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable CHESTER E. MERROW, delivered a number of very fine addresses while serving as a United States Delegate to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations.

There follows the first of these addresses, delivered on October 11, 1955, which is the first time in the history of the United Nations that such a thorough overall review of the administrative progress and problems in the United Nations and its specialized agencies had ever been given:

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS IN THE UNITED NATIONS AND ITS AGENCIES

(Statement by CHESTER E. MERROW, United States Representative to the General Assembly)

As you know, it has become almost a tradition in the United States for the President to appoint at least two Members of the Congress to serve on the United States delegation to the United Nations. As in all countries, such an appointment is one of the highest honors which one can receive. I ac-

cordingly consider myself most fortunate to have been asked by President Eisenhower to serve as a delegate to this 10th General Assembly.

In the course of these first days of the General Assembly, I have had an opportunity to meet a number of my fellow delegates from many other countries. We have exchanged views on several topics. One of the favorite topics has been the comparison of assignments. In the course of our discussions, I have been struck by the fact that the Administrative and Budgetary Committee, to which we here have been assigned, is a central and all-important committee. Although the functions of the Committee are comparable to the Appropriations Committees of National Congresses and Parliaments, they also extend to broader problems of administration.

You, Mr. Chairman [Hans Engen], as the respected Ambassador of Norway, a country known for its interest in administration and economy, and the distinguished Chairman of the Advisory Committee, Ambassador Agnides, are among those whom I have met who share my own view of the importance of this Committee.

Because it is essential that the importance of this body, the counterpart of similar committees in our national parliaments, be fully understood, I hope I may be pardoned if I express my views on the work of the Administrative and Budgetary Committee and on its place in the United Nations structure.

First, and of special importance, is the fact that the Administrative and Budgetary Committee is the only place in the United Nations where the representatives of governments can examine together the organizational, administrative, and financial structure of the various parts of the United Nations system to insure the development of a sound and integrated whole. This opportunity is of particular interest to me. During my service in the Congress of the United States, I have had the privilege of serving as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements. This subcommittee conducted hearings and studied the operations of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, and other international organizations. I was also head of a mission that visited all of the specialized agencies located in Europe, as well as the branch office of the United Nations. This mission discussed with the key officials of these agencies many of the problems which concern us here. The report of the mission to the Congress has been printed and given public distribution. With Ambassador Agnides, I share the experience and memory of attending the 1945 conference in London that drafted the UNESCO constitution. All of this makes the opportunity for an exchange of views in the General Assembly especially welcome.

It is well, perhaps, in this 10th anniversary year of the United Nations, to begin with an across-the-board look at the developments in our major fields of concern—organizational matters, budgets and contributions, personnel policy, and coordination of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

#### GROWTH OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

First, in the organizational field. The years since the establishment of the United Nations have seen a growth not only in the United Nations itself but also the development of 10 specialized agencies of the United Nations. There is the International Labor Organization, which was originally part of the League of Nations and is seeking to raise labor standards and improve working conditions. The Food and Agriculture Organization has been established to improve food and agricultural production and distribution. To promote peace through collaboration in educational, scientific, and cultural

matters, there is the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. The International Civil Aviation Organization aims at developing international air transport and improving standards of international air navigation. The task of facilitating exchange of mail and improving world postal services falls to the Universal Postal Union, one of the oldest international organizations, dating back to 1875. The World Health Organization is dedicated to raising world health standards. The International Telecommunication Union, which stems from an organization established in 1865, is engaged in promoting the rational and efficient use of telecommunication facilities. Better weather reporting is the aim of the World Meteorological Organization, a recent outgrowth of the International Meteorological Organization. The International Bank and the International Monetary Fund undertake to facilitate the investment of capital for productive purposes and to promote currency stability.

In addition to these permanent and regularly supported specialized agencies, there are now five programs operating under United Nations aegis with the assistance of voluntary contributions. These are the International Children's Fund, to promote maternal and child welfare; the Technical Assistance Program, to bring about higher living standards; the Palestine Relief and Works Agency, to provide food, shelter, and gainful employment for nearly 900,000 refugees; the Korean Reconstruction Agency, to relieve the suffering and repair the devastation caused by aggression; and the Refugee Fund, to find permanent solutions for limited groups of refugees.

The activities of these agencies and programs extend to nearly every part of the world—to approximately 90 countries and territories, in fact, thus reaching far beyond the membership of the United Nations itself. The result is a growth in the size of the regular international secretariats until they now total more than 9,000 persons. To this must be added the internationally recruited personnel required to operate the voluntary programs—a total of approximately 2,200 persons. This is exclusive of local assistance which runs into the thousands.

This trend has led to organizational decentralization, and this in turn raises the most difficult kind of management problems, many of which have yet to be solved in a satisfactory manner. Through his organizational survey extending over the last 2 years, the Secretary-General has sought to assess the character of the problems which the United Nations faces in this area. He is now in the process of instituting measures designed to improve overall United Nations management and control of its far-flung operations. Whether current measures are an adequate answer to this problem remains to be seen. I am convinced that efforts in the same direction should be continued in the United Nations and should be undertaken in the specialized agencies.

#### TOTAL COST OF THE U. N. SYSTEM

The Information Annex to the Budget Estimates for 1956 (Document A/2904/Add.1) shows us that the gross budgets of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, exclusive of the International Bank and International Monetary Fund, total \$85 million in 1955. To this should be added \$102,500,000, representing the approximate 1955 operating level of the voluntarily financed United Nations programs of the International Children's Fund, the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance, the Refugee Fund, the Palestine Relief and Works Agency, and the Korean Reconstruction Agency. The combined total of regular budgets and voluntary programs for 1955 approximate \$187,500,000. This compares to a total expenditure figure of approximately \$122,500,000 in 1947, the



first fully operative year of the United Nations, the Children's Fund, and the then existing specialized agencies (inclusive of the International Refugee Organization, but exclusive of the International Bank and Fund).

For the period from 1946 to 1954 inclusive, the total of the United Nations and the currently existing specialized agency expenditures (exclusive of the Bank and Fund) amount to approximately \$601 million. If the budgets for 1955 are added, the cumulative total to date is \$686 million. Add to this \$665 million representing the amount spent on the voluntarily financed programs of the United Nations for the same period, plus \$412,700,000 expended by the International Refugee Organization, and we see that a total of \$1,764,000,000 has been devoted by the international community to the work of the United Nations agencies.

If these facts and figures are to be really meaningful in terms of the task of this committee, it is necessary to analyze them briefly. The 1947 figures represent the initial development stage of the United Nations, the International Children's Fund, and 7 specialized agencies, 1 of which is no longer in operation, namely, the International Refugee Organization. The 1955 figure represents the going programs of the United Nations, 8 of the specialized agencies, and 5 major operating agencies, supported by voluntary funds.

Translated into activities, the growing figures spell cooperative international endeavor to keep the peace, to raise standards of living through economic and social development, to feed the hungry, to care for the displaced and homeless, to fight disease and ignorance, to facilitate man's efforts to communicate, and to enhance man's enjoyment of work and life. Given these goals, the funds expended can be easily justified, provided this committee and its counterpart in other agencies exercise the necessary vigilance to insure that waste, inefficiency, organizational defects, and unnecessary overhead are eliminated and that the results achieved are commensurate with the outlay of funds. The fact that the United Nations budget seems to have reached a stabilization point does not mean that we should relax our efforts to find ways and means of improving efficiency and eliminating unnecessary activities. This is a continuing responsibility of good stewardship. The budgets of the specialized agencies should likewise be subjected to continuing and careful scrutiny by governments.

#### SHARING OF COSTS

At the same time that these regular budgets of the United Nations agencies have been increasing, there has been a trend toward more equitable sharing of costs, so that no one member pays more than one-third of the total budget in any agency. The payment record in all agencies would indicate that with few exceptions, where the circumstances are most unusual, assessments upon governments have not exceeded their capacity or willingness to pay. This presents a sharp contrast to the situation existing in the programs financed by voluntary contributions, viz, the United Nations International Children's Fund, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, United Nations Refugee Fund, and the Expanded Technical Assistance Program.

We had a report last week from Mr. Cutts, the chairman of the special committee set up to negotiate and collect contributions for these programs. This report indicated that pledges in particular lag far behind the financial targets which have been set in order to operate an adequate program. This is in spite of the fact that the larger contributors assume a higher proportion of the total costs than is the case with the regular

budgets. In the light of the important tasks assigned to these agencies, I believe we should give serious attention to the possible reasons for this situation—whether targets are set too high or governments are ignoring their responsibilities or both.

The support of all member governments—and I stress the word "all"—for the causes served by the programs of the United Nations agencies must be sustained and indeed increased. The form of such support, i. e., through an international agency or otherwise, and the amount of money devoted to it will require a continuing assessment of the following factors, among others:

(a) whether an international agency can be demonstrated to be the best instrument for meeting the needs which are justifiably the concern of the international community;

(b) the degree to which the members of such an agency are willing to bear an equitable share of the financial burdens entailed in assuming such international responsibilities. It is an inescapable fact that, if the brunt of the costs fall upon a few member states, the undertaking is not truly international and misunderstandings will surely result;

(c) and lastly, whether international assistance will be adequately supported and supplemented by national endeavor.

#### PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Another major area of continual concern to this committee has been the development of sound personnel policies. The record will show, I believe, that this has been one of the most challenging but difficult aspects of the development of international organizations. This is due not only to the human and personal problems involved, but also to the vastly different national traditions and approaches in dealing with these problems. Nevertheless, considerable progress has been made in developing among the United Nations agencies good, sound, and consistent conditions of service in respect of such matters as salaries and allowances, pensions, leave, sickness, and disability benefits. Past and current debate in this committee and in the specialized agencies indicates, however, the continued existence of numerous unsolved problems connected with staff morale and with the selection, development, and maintenance of competent staff of the highest integrity.

For example, concern has been reiterated many times on such problems as attracting high caliber staff, equitable geographical distribution, eliminating incompetent or unsuitable staff, giving encouragement and recognition to competent staff, and development of an esprit de corps within the organization. These utterances, together with expressed attitudes and actions of the various staff councils, indicate that far greater attention and emphasis needs to be given to ways and means of improving personnel management. It would appear to be essential, for example, to develop recognized and accepted standards of competence for selection and promotion and to evolve methods for applying these as objectively as possible. Member governments, the staff, and the public at large must be assured that the controlling criteria are the charter standards of the highest integrity, competence, and efficiency, and that to the extent that these standards are met, due regard is paid to recruiting on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

A second consideration is that perhaps the time has come to examine the concept of geographical representation to see whether the interests of the organization might be better served if this is interpreted to be a fair representation of the various cultures indigenous to the various member states. A mere counting of heads by nationality does not serve the purpose of enriching the organization by the provision of diversified training, background, and traditions. Still another

factor requiring attention is mentioned by the International Civil Service Advisory Board, a group of international experts in this field, when it emphasized that adequate staff induction and training, as well as effective supervision, are especially important in an international organization. Yet there appears to be little evidence throughout the agencies of specific programs to insure that these needs are met. These are but a few examples, but I believe this recital serves to illustrate how much more can and should be done in the interest of improving effectiveness of the staff.

#### COORDINATION OF UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

While I have sought to present an overall summary of administrative progress and problems in the United Nations and its specialized agencies, such a survey would not be complete without mention of the question of coordination, as such. Considerable progress in coordination among the United Nations and its specialized agencies has been made in the administrative field. There are, for example, a generally comparable salary allowance and leave system, a common pension system, comparable personnel and financial regulations, and certain common administrative services. This accomplishment has been primarily due to the combined efforts of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, the Administrative Committee on Coordination and its subcommittees, and the consistency of positions of many of the governments represented in the various organizations.

In view of this and the work being undertaken by the Economic and Social Council to insure coordination and integration of program planning, it seems timely to my delegation to explore what measures this committee might recommend to improve the combined operations and effectiveness of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

Before advancing the suggestions of my delegation, let me state briefly what I believe the basic relation of the United Nations and its agencies should be. The central fact is that each agency, regardless of its constitutional autonomy, is a vital part of the whole United Nations system. In the eyes of the world, the success of a specialized agency is considered the success of the United Nations itself and vice versa. Likewise, the weakness of a specialized agency is considered to be the weakness of the United Nations. There is a reality we should not ignore.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Against this background of progress and problems, I shall proceed to outline the views of my delegation on both the issues before us which require immediate action and those on which attention needs to be focused and an exchange of views encouraged if solutions are to be eventually developed.

1. We are satisfied with the role of the Advisory Committee and the Contributions Committee, and we shall on most points support their recommendations for the 1956 United Nations budget and scale of assessment. We note that both committees are authorized by the Assembly to render service to the specialized agencies. The Contributions Committee has been called upon by numerous agencies to provide factual and statistical data. The Advisory Committee received authorization last year to visit the specialized agencies, upon their invitation, to continue the study of administrative and budgetary coordination. It is understood that at least one agency has extended an invitation to the Advisory Committee. It is to be hoped that others will do likewise, since there is a very real need for the budget of every U. N. organization to have the careful and thorough type of expert examination which is given by the Advisory Committee on behalf of governments.



The advantage of having one group do the task for all agencies is obvious. It is a means by which the administration and governments in each agency can obtain objective advice on administrative improvements that would lead to better results for the money expended. It offers a means of identifying and focusing attention on common problems and the solutions thereto. The question arises, however, as to how the Advisory Committee can fulfill its responsibilities to the Assembly and at the same time perform a useful role on behalf of the agencies.

Since article 17 of the United Nations Charter places upon the Assembly certain responsibilities for review of specialized agency budgets, we can all agree that from the standpoint of the General Assembly as well as of the specialized agencies it is important for the Advisory Committee to undertake such a role. The problem therefore boils down to one of practical arrangements. It would appear to my delegation that there are several possible courses of action that would enable the Advisory Committee to fulfill this enlarged role satisfactorily to all concerned. Before advancing any specific suggestions on this matter, however, I think it is more fitting that we should profit from any views the Advisory Committee itself may have on this point. I hope that Ambassador Aghnides, with his usual wisdom, can point the way for a fruitful discussion among delegations and representatives of the specialized agencies.

2. The second major suggestion which grows out of my introductory analysis is in response to the need for giving more attention to achieving better personnel management. This, of course, can only be done successfully if the head of each agency recognizes the importance of this matter and gives it his full support. Otherwise day-to-day operations will tend to crowd out such a program. We would urge that the Secretary-General and the heads of the various agencies give this matter high priority during the course of the next few years. It is important that the U. N. organizations benefit from modern techniques in personnel management. One rather concrete proposal which suggests itself on the basis of current United States experience is the institution of an incentive award system.

The President of the United States, with congressional approval, initiated a program of this kind last November, as a means of enlisting the ingenuity and inventiveness of every member of the United States civil service in the cause of greater efficiency and productivity. The Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission reported recently that during the first 7 months of operation 138,000 suggestions were received, 35,000 adopted, about \$1,500,000 were paid out in cash awards, and the taxpayer benefited to the extent of savings of \$40 million. While the unique and complex character of personnel problems in international organizations may require considerable modification of national experience, it is still valid to expect that these organizations can benefit from experience like that of the United States.

We also believe that the International Civil Service Advisory Board could play a useful and more active role in this connection. To date the Board has issued advisory reports covering recruitment, training, and standards of conduct. They provide basic policy guides which can and should be used to better purpose by all agencies, but there has been no followup. More could be done by the Board, particularly in assisting those organizations to plan and develop sound programs of this kind, tailored to the agency's needs.

3. My third major suggestion is directed to both the secretariats and the governments represented here and in other agencies. I believe, and it is the belief of my Government, that greater vigilance and restraint are

required in order to avoid an unduly large proportion of international budgets being used for administrative and overhead services. There are a number of specific measures which could and should be employed with greater fidelity to curb this tendency and which should lead to greater economy.

(a) In the absence of exceptional circumstances, major meetings of international organizations should be held at headquarters.

(b) Meetings should be scheduled to avoid peaks and valleys in the workloads for secretariats and governments.

(c) There should be strict publication and documentation control. In this connection, my delegation would like to suggest that the fifth committee might set an example and establish a healthy precedent by foregoing summary records except for important debates. For many items on the agenda, such as those we have just disposed of, the report of the committee constitutes an adequate account of the proceedings.

This is not solely a United Nations problem. The following plaintive note is sounded in the report of the Program Commission of the last General Conference of UNESCO.

"In conclusion, the Commission wishes to call the attention of the General Conference to certain problems which have not only caused delay but have also, in many cases, reduced the effectiveness of its work. First is the problem of paperwork. Never before has the Commission had to consider so many documents as this year. \* \* \* A considerable number of important resolutions were hidden in these piles of papers, from which they had to be sorted out in order to be adopted, or more often than not held over for another meeting, or amended, or reamended, until one's head began to spin."

This has an all-too-familiar ring and has been echoed in these halls as well as elsewhere.

(d) Meetings should start promptly. In this, some of the technical agencies such as WHO maintain a better record than the United Nations organs. The International Scientific Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in Geneva last August was outstanding on this score. The following excerpt from the closing address of the president of the conference, Dr. Bhabha, of India, points to the fact that:

"Its success is also due to the spirit and the manner in which all the delegates have played their part. From the very beginning meetings have begun and ended on time, and all the speakers have adhered to the time limit set in the program. I am told that this is by no means a usual feature of international conferences. The difference can perhaps be attributed to the circumstance that, in a scientific conference such as this, each speaker has something concrete to communicate. I suppose that, when one has nothing too concrete to communicate, there is no inherent reason why, having started speaking, one should stop."

My colleagues will be greatly relieved, I am sure, to know that I have taken the last comment of Dr. Bhabha to heart and that very soon I will stop.

#### ADDITIONAL SPECIAL ITEMS

Mr. Chairman, I should like to indicate at this point the United States position on several nonrecurring items which are important primarily in the United Nations context.

My delegation strongly supports the recommendations of the Special Committee on Judicial Review of Administrative Tribunal Judgments and hopes that the report of that committee will enable the Fifth Committee to deal with this item with a minimum of debate.

The United States Government is also gratified to note that the Secretary General plans to complete the headquarters construction in 1956 and, in this connection, to erect

a memorial plaque for those who have died in the service of the United Nations. We also consider it eminently just and proper for the Fifth Committee to act favorably on the proposal to establish a memorial cemetery in Korea.

I could not close these general remarks without expressing the appreciation of my delegation for the work of the various standing committees which serve the Fifth Committee so faithfully, such as the Advisory Committee, the Contributions Committee, and the Board of Auditors.

My delegation would also like to associate itself with the thanks expressed by the chairman of the Advisory Committee, in the foreword to the committee's first report, to the persons who have contributed to the work of the Advisory Committee. This particularly applies to the valuable assistance rendered by Mr. Watson Sellar, retiring member of the Board of Auditors, and Mr. Hans Christian Andersen, retiring Controller, both of whom have contributed so much to the sound financial management of the United Nations. The Fifth Committee is indebted to Mr. Sellar, who has served since the inception of the United Nations, for his personal contribution to the development of a thoroughgoing audit system and for the enormous assistance rendered by the staff of his Government department. Tribute is also due the Government of Canada, which has made this possible.

If, as on this occasion and others, we feel it necessary to comment critically on certain details of United Nations administration, we do so only out of a desire to be helpful and constructive. My delegation is convinced that the United Nations must continue to examine and improve its administrative practices if it is to fulfill the great hopes that we—and I think the whole world—have for its continued growth as an instrument working for peace in this nuclear age. I have no doubt that my colleagues on this committee are as conscious as I am of the great responsibility we bear as overseers of an organization which embodies so much hope and promise. If the United Nations is to play the role expected of it in this disorderly and uncertain world, those who carry out its mandate will have to function with a high sense of duty and teamwork.

Convinced as we are of the challenge and the difficulty which this administrative task places upon the Secretary-General, we stand ready always to cooperate with him. His term of office has been marked by accomplishments and improvements which merit our sincere pride and gratitude.

I am confident that, if properly supported, the United Nations system as it enters its second decade will grow, develop, and increase in influence and effectiveness. We are engaged in waging peace with an intensity and earnestness of purpose never before experienced in the history of the world. In that great effort the United Nations system serves as one of mankind's major instrumentalities. The charter is a living organism and has developed and must continue to develop as a potent instrument for meeting the many complex problems of international character which know no boundary lines. As we try to project the future, we can be certain that, with a concerted effort on the part of all of us, the United Nations system will succeed and help man realize his greatest hope and that a new and peaceful world will emerge through the instrumentality of the U. N. structure. Toward that goal the Administrative and Budgetary Committee, by making possible more efficient use of available funds, can make a major contribution.

Mr. Speaker, there follows the final address delivered by the Honorable CHESTER E. MERROW, while serving as a United States delegate to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations.



This address was delivered before the General Assembly on December 16, 1955, and gives a thorough review of the United States position on the United Nations budget for 1956 and the need for improved budget procedure and sound fiscal policies in the United Nations. During the 83d Congress, Mr. MERROW had served as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, and had conducted thorough studies of this subject matter. He thus brought to his U. N. assignment a background of solid and valuable experience.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN CHESTER E. MERROW, UNITED STATES DELEGATE, IN PLenary SESSION ON THE UNITED NATIONS BUDGET FOR 1956

My delegation will support in this plenary session the total appropriation for 1956 voted by the Fifth Committee, but it does so with some reservations.

#### ANALYSIS OF BUDGET INCREASES

With the forewarning which we had received as to the necessity for a large supplemental appropriation for 1955 to cover such items as the Geneva Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, it was the expressed hope of my delegation at the outset of the debate in the Fifth Committee that we could keep the 1956 budget to the level recommended by the Advisory Committee, namely, \$46,016,000. Instead, the budget approved by the Fifth Committee has reached \$48,566,350, an increase of approximately \$1,600,000 over the budget which this Assembly approved last year for 1955.

These increases fall largely into four categories of expenditures; i. e., activities related to peaceful uses of atomic energy, technical assistance in the social welfare and human rights field, operation of field offices and special missions, and salary adjustments. My delegation in the budgetary committee supported important program expansion and some increased expenditures in all of these items except the one relating to salary adjustments. We opposed some of the appropriations voted for program expansion, and we opposed the increase in headquarters cost-of-living allowance. We recognized that changing economic conditions and particularly the increase in United States Federal Government salaries necessitated a reappraisal of the adequacy of the total level of United Nations remuneration. We were opposed to the Secretary General's proposal for a cost-of-living adjustment at this time because, on the basis of prevailing standards in United Nations and the specialized agencies, there is no present justification for this kind of a salary increase.

However, we believe that the establishment of a committee composed of governmental experts to review the salary, allowance, and benefit system in 1956, is a welcome development. Such a review should make it possible to achieve two objectives: Namely, (1) to adjust the common remuneration system of the United Nations and the specialized agencies to present-day requirements for attracting and holding a highly qualified multinational staff in positions in all parts of the world, and (2) to make these adjustments in a manner which takes adequate account of the responsibilities and financial resources of international organizations and the standards of remuneration in national public services.

In this connection, Mr. President, may I state that the United States Government is not satisfied with the present level of participation by United States nationals in the various international secretariats and technical assistance programs. We trust the recommendations of the committee will be such as to encourage an increased number of

United States nationals to seek international employment, not only at the United Nations headquarters but also at other international agency centers as well.

While a number of the proposals for additional budgetary increases were resisted by the committee, my delegation was disappointed that the proposals for increased expenditures were not offset to a larger extent by compensating economies. We had hoped, for example, to make some savings by altering the regulations for publication of treaties. Likewise, we had hoped to defer less essential items, such as expenditures for improvement of facilities for conferences and meetings in Geneva.

The net result of all of the financial decisions taken by the Fifth Committee is that the expenditures to be assessed in respect of the 1955 supplemental appropriation and the 1956 budget will total \$51,830,550, the largest in United Nations history (I might add parenthetically that we hope that this 10th General Assembly will securely hold this dubious distinction unchallenged for many years to come). The amount of these appropriations is due not only to the increase of \$1,600,000 in the 1956 budget to which I have already referred, but also to the coincidental occurrence of unusually high supplemental expenditures in respect of 1955, without the offsetting savings that were available last year. The supplemental items for 1955 include \$1,400,000 of the total cost of \$2,361,000 for the International Scientific Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy; \$1,630,000 representing the last appropriation for reimbursement of national taxes to staff members; and other unforeseen costs relating to such matters as the disarmament meeting in London, and the Secretary General's successful trip in accordance with the General Assembly's directive to obtain the release of 11 United States prisoners and other personnel of the United Nations Command captured in the Korean war.

#### BASIS FOR UNITED STATES SUPPORT

Despite its concern over the upturn of United Nations expenditures just at the point when we had anticipated stabilization, the United States will support the appropriation recommended by the Fifth Committee for 1956. We do so in recognition of two facts: (1) That the Secretary General and the General Assembly have, over the past 2 years, made a real effort and considerable progress in reducing the regular budget and (2) that a sizable amount of the increased assessments being voted for 1956 is of a nonrecurring character. My delegation strongly urges, however, that the upward trend of expenditures reflected in the 1956 budgets of not only the United Nations but also the specialized agencies not be considered as establishing a precedent for future years.

In an earlier statement before the Fifth Committee, I expressed the belief that the support of all member governments for the causes served by the programs of the United Nations agencies should be sustained and indeed increased. This should not be interpreted, however, as urging increases in the regular budgets. The avenues by which these causes can be served are many. As I indicated in the Fifth Committee, the form of such support; i. e., whether through the regular budgets of international organizations, through international voluntary programs, or through such other forms of intergovernmental cooperations as bilateral programs, will require a continuing assessment of the following factors, among others:

(a) Whether an international agency can be demonstrated to be the best instrument for meeting the need which are justifiably the concern of the international community;

(b) the degree to which the members of such an agency are willing to bear an equitable share of the financial burdens entailed in assuming such international responsibilities. It is an inescapable fact that, if the brunt of the costs falls upon a relatively few member states, the undertaking is not truly international, and lasting and bitter misunderstandings will surely result; and

(c) whether international assistance will be adequately supported and supplemented by national endeavor.

One further fact that must be continuously borne in mind by member states as well as the Secretariat was pointed out to us by the Secretary-General last year in his annual report. He stated: "That the very nature of the responsibilities that must be assumed by the Secretary-General and his senior staff imposes a limit on the volume of the tasks that can be handled effectively, irrespective of the additional funds, personnel, and facilities that might be placed at their disposal."

All of these factors dictate caution in the expansion by the General Assembly of the permanent establishments and the regular budgets of international organizations. This does not mean that pressing world problems will be neglected by the community of nations represented here and in the specialized agencies; far from it.

Although the sum total of the regular budgets of the United Nations and currently existing specialized agencies for the period 1946 to 1955 inclusive approximates \$686 million, an additional amount of more than \$1 billion has been contributed to international programs, especially designed to provide relief and rehabilitation for refugees, to give technical assistance for economic and social development, and to promote maternal and child welfare. In addition, very material assistance in promoting economic development is provided through the facilities of the International Bank and Monetary Fund. And augmenting all of these efforts are large national programs of assistance such as the United States technical cooperation plan and regional programs such as the Colombo plan. The value and results which derive from such a flexible, many-pronged approach to these problems cannot be overestimated and should not be jeopardized by premature or unrealistic expansion of the regular budgets and staffs of international organizations.

#### IMPROVED BUDGET PROCEDURE

In expressing our hopes regarding the budget to be presented next year, I should also like to mention our interest in seeing the Advisory Committee and the Assembly develop a more simplified form of the budget that will enable the financial control exercised by the Assembly and the Secretary-General to be more effective and will, at the same time, reduce administrative redtape.

We welcome, too, the initiative taken by the distinguished delegate of Denmark in the Fifth Committee in calling our attention to the need for improving the organization and scheduling of the Fifth Committee's work. This led to a fruitful discussion on ways and means of eliminating delays and of facilitating, in particular, the review of the budget and decisions relating thereto.

The Assembly will note in the report of the Fifth Committee that the United States suggested that the agenda of the 11th session of the General Assembly might include an item entitled "General Assembly Procedures for Consideration and Adoption of the Budget." We are pleased that the Secretary-General will give this matter his attention during this next year.

While experience, particularly this year, has shown the need for procedural improvements, I should like to testify to the skill of the chairman of the Fifth Committee. With the difficulties we faced, only the di-



rection of a superb chairman could save us. My delegation believes that we, therefore, owe a special debt of gratitude to Ambassador Engen of Norway.

#### COORDINATION OF U. N. AND AGENCIES

In matters of coordination with the specialized agencies, the decision of the Fifth Committee to support the Secretary-General's request for increases in salaries and in the education allowance was, in our judgment, without sufficient notice to the specialized agencies. This seems a regrettable departure from the repeated emphasis given by the Assembly to the desirability of coordinating administrative policies and practices among the United Nations and the Agencies.

On the other hand, the Fifth Committee did recommend that the United Nations offer its assistance to the International Telecommunications Union and World Meteorological Organization in constructing a headquar-

ters that would permit them to share the facilities of the Palais des Nations with the United Nations and the World Health Organization. We hope that this will eventuate in closer relationships among these organizations and that it will be ultimately possible for them and us to benefit from the greater use of common services that would result from living under the same roof.

Another step that should be conducive to improved coordination of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in the administrative field is the decision of the Advisory Committee to undertake a more intensive review of problems in this area. This will be possible by consultations at the headquarters of several specialized agencies during the coming years. We commend the agencies, the Advisory Committee, and its distinguished chairman, Ambassador Aghnides, on this constructive approach.

To summarize, Mr. President, my delegation will support the recommended appropriation, in spite of its reservations. We believe that, through the exercise of restraint and the constructive application of our joint efforts, the members of the United Nations should be able to regulate better any further budgetary expansion. We are confident that, by following sound fiscal policies and by inaugurating improved methods of budgetary management and control, the United Nations will be greatly strengthened. The budget is, of course, the reflection of the development of the activities of the organization. The appropriations place in practical effect the provisions of the budget. My delegation firmly believes that, by continued pursuance of sound financial principles, the United Nations during its second decade will increase in influence and effectiveness as the greatest force for helping man to realize his hopes for bringing about a peaceful world.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, January 16, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Archbishop John Theodorovich, metropolitan of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States, offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, let us pray.

Our eternal and Almighty Father: Thou gavest us life. Our destiny is in the mystery of Thy unknown will. Thou leadest us, and givest us Thy gifts on the paths of life: the lamps of the mind; and the light of Thy wisdom.

Bless, Almighty Father, the Senate of our country. Keep its Members in good health, in the full strength of mind, and in the light of Thy law. Direct them in their decisions, and may they be always in Thy will. Bless, Almighty Father, our President of the United States of America, and afford him a full recovery of health.

Pray show us all, in these turbulent times of struggle between the forces of good and evil, that we are our brother's keepers. We now know that none of us can stand alone, no nation, no man, no one. May Thy divine will bring us closer together as brothers in mind and spirit. Give us strength more and more to live the lives of Good Samaritans, to create neighborliness, and common interests between all men.

On this day of Ukrainian independence, let us renew our support for freedom as we are reminded of that country brutally conquered by rule of terror and compulsion.

We pray to Thee, Almighty God, to give us grace to see that the strugglers for freedom everywhere remember enslaved Ukraine, and give her love and moral support, for the hungry desire of freedom that is there.

O, God, be gracious to us all, and keep in Thy grace the Senate of the United States and all its Members.

We earnestly and humbly pray to Thee.

Grant us, Father, our prayers. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 18, 1956, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 19, 1956.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6376. An act to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7871. An act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953.

### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 6376. An act to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7871. An act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953; placed on the calendar.

### ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, and that any statement made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### REPORT ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS FOR WORK IN THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States, for the period July 1 through November 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize permanent appointments in the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### AMENDMENT OF POLIOMYELITIS VACCINATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1955

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend through June 30, 1957, the duration of the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.